WHITE PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DILEMMAS IN MENTORING AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN AND YOUTHS

BY

STEVEN C. DAVIS

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

LIST OF TABLES..... vi

ABSTRACT..... vii

CHAPTERS

1 BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY..... 1

Statement of the Problem..... 7
Rationale for the Study..... 10
Definition of Terms..... 11

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

Multiculturalism: A Challenge for Teacher Educators..... 13
Preservice Teacher Cohort..... 20
Current Research on Multicultural Teacher Education: An Overview..... 22
Summary..... 51

3 METHODOLOGY..... 56

Participants..... 60
Selection of participants..... 61
Participants' teacher education coursework..... 62
Data Collection..... 66
Participant interviewing..... 68
Participant observation..... 75
Written artifacts..... 80
Data Analysis..... 83
Validity and Reliability..... 86
Generalizability..... 88
Researcher Biases and Qualifications..... 89
Ethical Issues..... 93
Overview of the Case Studies..... 93

4 ANNIE AND BETSY..... 95
Organization of the Chapter..... 95
Overview of Kinds of Dilemmas..... 97

Overview of Participants' Resolutions and Roles..... 102
Participant Number 1 (P1): Annie..... 103
Description of Annie's Mentoring Sessions..... 105
Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 108
Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Knowing About Her Own Thinking and Learning..... 113
Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: The Mentee Lacks Knowledge, Skills, Ability, or Aptitude..... 114
Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing the People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Mentee's Family..... 117
Annie's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution..... 118
Resolution pattern 1: Fix the problem..... 120
Resolution pattern 2: Monitoring the situation..... 125
Summary..... 130
Participant Number 2 (P2): Betsy..... 131
Description of Betsy's Mentoring Sessions..... 134
Betsy's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 137
Betsy's Dilemmas of Knowing the Mentee: Mentee Demonstrates Resistance..... 142
Betsy's Dilemmas of Knowing the People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Mentee's Family..... 144
Betsy's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution..... 145
Resolution pattern 1: Finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do..... 146
Resolution Pattern 2: Accepting responsibility..... 148
Resolution Pattern 3: Showing Affection to the Mentee..... 150
Summary..... 151
Comparison of Annie and Betsy: The Committed Mentors..... 152

5 CINDY AND DAWN..... 156
Organization of the Chapter..... 157
Overview of Kinds of Dilemmas..... 158

Overview of Participants' Resolutions and Roles..... 160
Participant Number 3 (P3): Cindy..... 161
Cindy's dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 163
Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: Mentee Demonstrates Learned Helplessness..... 170
Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Dealing with Emotions..... 171
Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing About the People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Residents..... 173
Cindy's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution..... 174
Resolution Pattern 1: Know your limits..... 175
Resolution Pattern 2: Search for the right procedure..... 177
Resolution Pattern 3: Getting the mentee engaged..... 178
Summary..... 179
Participant Number 4 (P4): Dawn..... 181
Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 184
Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Dealing with Emotions..... 191
Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: Mentee Lacks Knowledge, Skills, Ability, or Aptitude..... 193
Dawn's Role and Pattern of Dilemma Resolution..... 194
Summary..... 200
Comparison of Cindy and Dawn: The Mentors Who Were Not Committed..... 201

6 PREVALENT DILEMMAS AND DIVERSE RESOLUTION STRATEGIES: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS..... 207
Theoretical Framework: Dilemma Language and Lay Theory..... 209
Dilemma Language and Mentoring Dilemmas..... 212
Lay Theory and Mentoring Dilemmas..... 214
Annie's lay theory and approach to mentoring..... 217
Betsy's lay theory and approach to mentoring..... 224
Cindy's lay theory and approach to mentoring..... 236
Dawn's lay theory and approach to mentoring..... 242

Summary: The Role of Participants' Lay Theories and Teaching Archetypes..... 247
The Influence of Stakeholders on Mentors' Dilemmas..... 249
The influence of university personnel on mentors' dilemmas..... 250
The influence of supervising teachers on mentors' dilemmas..... 251
The influence of parents and caregivers on mentors' dilemmas..... 251
The influence of mentees on mentors' dilemmas..... 254
Discussion and Recommendations..... 255
Finding 1. The Participants' Most Frequently Occurring Dilemmas were Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 255
Finding 2. The Participants' Resolution Patterns were Diverse and they Reflected their Live Experiences and their Definitions of Mentoring..... 263
Summary..... 271

APPENDIX..... 273

REFERENCES..... 274

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH..... 287

LIST OF TABLES

Table
page

4-1 Counts of Domains and Dilemmas in Categories..... 98

4-2 Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach..... 98

4-3 Dilemmas of Knowing Myself..... 100

4-4 Dilemmas of Knowing the Mentee..... 101

4-5 Dilemmas of Knowing the People in the neighborhood..... 101

4-6 Annie's Resolution Pattern and Strategy Counts..... 121

4-7 Betsy's Resolution Pattern Counts..... 146

5-1 Cindy's Resolution Pattern Counts..... 175

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

WHITE PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DILEMMAS
IN MENTORING AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN AND YOUTHS

BY

Steven C. Davis

May 2000

Chairperson: Dr. Elizabeth Bondy
Major Department: School of Teaching and Learning

This investigation focused on how four first semester preservice teachers experienced dilemmas working as mentors with African American children and youths in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. Bright Futures is a multicultural teacher education program aimed at helping preservice teachers learn to work well with diverse learners. Four interpretive case studies were constructed that illustrate how four white, middle class, female mentors identified and resolved mentoring dilemmas. Dilemmas were defined as the kind of problems or problematic situations characterized by a pull or feeling of tension caused by cognitive dissonance combined with a change in emotional status. Two guiding questions drove the study:

1. What dilemmas do white, female mentors identify as they work with African American children in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program?
2. How do mentors resolve dilemmas?

Qualitative methods of data collection and analysis were used for conducting this study, derived of the participants' perspectives on their mentoring dilemmas. Data were gathered by ethnographic interviews, field observations and written artifacts produced by the participants. Several interviews were conducted with each participant during the 10-week field experience. Each participant was observed once per week.

The four participants described 21 dilemmas in the categories of knowing how to teach, knowing myself, knowing about the mentee, and knowing the people in the neighborhood. The most pervasive category was knowing how to teach, which included 13 dilemmas that comprised 70 percent of all dilemmas documented for the study. Dilemmas of knowing how to teach were pedagogical in nature and revolved around participants' lack of knowledge about and experience in teaching.

Analysis of the ways in which they resolved dilemmas yielded the finding that the participants' resolutions occurred in diverse patterns. The participants resorted to practices that resembled the most familiar strategies they knew: Traditional teaching methods. Most often, these strategies were familiar to the participants and were aimed at helping the mentees with academic skills. Other significant influences such as parents and caregivers, supervising teachers, and the mentees played a role in how the participants identified and resolved dilemmas.

CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Vigorous debates on educational aims are never in short supply. Assimilationists, who speak of melting pots and the American Way, and pluralists, who see American society as a mosaic (Cushner, McClelland, & Safford, 1996) continually argue over what values should guide us in many realms of society, especially education. Assimilationists argue for climbing the ladder to success through individual merit, while pluralists point out that for social equity and justice to prevail, a level playing field is necessary. While this perpetual debate over the aims of public education continues, educational inequities persist (Apple, 1990; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Education scholars and researchers suggest that these inequities translate into glaring disparities in our educational system, especially in the rates of school success for children of color (Anyon, 1980; Cushner, McClelland, & Safford, 1996; Dilworth, 1992; Haberman, 1996).

A common explanation for the miseducation of children of color is the widening gap between the backgrounds of students and teachers in our schools. Demographic studies show public school classrooms growing more diverse while the teaching cohort becomes more homogeneous (Dilworth, 1992; Grant & Secada, 1990; Zeichner, 1993). Demographers predict that by the year 2020, children of color will comprise 46 percent of

all students enrolled in public schools (Cushner, McClelland, & Safford, 1996). Additionally, the National Center for Educational Statistics (1991) states that more than 20 percent of the school population are children at or below the poverty line.

In stark contrast, studies show that white, middle or upper class females represent the growing majority of classroom and preservice teachers (Grant & Secada, 1990). The contrast has been characterized as a national disaster (Grossman, 1995 p.1) because it has been said to contribute to the inequitable education of diverse learners (Banks & Banks, 1993; Cannella & Reiff, 1994; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Grossman, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Sleeter & Grant, 1994). What is problematic about a largely white, middle class, female preservice teacher cohort?

To some, the differences between teachers' and students' cultures and backgrounds lead to what has been described as cultural clash (Armaline, 1995) or cultural conflict (Tellez, Hlebowitsh, Cohen, & Norwood, 1995). According to Armaline (1995), cultural clash occurs when white, middle-class preservice teachers enter urban schools. Researchers from the pluralist perspective contend that many preservice teachers view the problems they encounter while working with diverse learners as symptoms of students' pathology, including having a deprived home life, a substandard work ethic, and low regard for schooling; more succinctly, many preservice teachers believe that children from certain backgrounds have something wrong with them.

Armaline (1995) asserts that the conflicts that arise as a result of cultural clashes stem from differences in perspective; preservice teachers often cannot view the world through the lenses of diverse learners. Therefore, according to Tellez et al. (1995), preservice teachers often construct or reconstruct stereotypes about students whose backgrounds are different from their own. In the pluralist view, such deflection by preservice teachers of the causes of problems they encounter with diverse learners leads to perpetuation of educational inequities (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Since the late 1980s, a surge of interest by educators in promoting educational equity has resulted in a movement toward multicultural education (Banks & Banks, 1989; Cushner et al., 1996). Likewise, some teacher educators have begun to make efforts to foster educational equity by promoting multicultural teacher education (Sleeter & Grant, 1994).

Despite increased attention to educational inequities in United States schools, teacher educators have responded slowly to the need for attention to improving teacher education for diversity (Grant & Secada, 1990). According to Martin (1995),

> There is little evidence to suggest that teacher education institutions have initiated comprehensive programs to reform the canon or aid educators in the quest to engage in alternative pedagogical structures that might better serve the needs of a diverse student population. (p. xi)

The need for well informed teachers capable of excelling in their work with the increasing number of diverse students is widely acknowledged, yet there are significant gaps in the research in this area. Grant (1994) found that the literature on teacher education pedagogy for diversity was

lacking in quantity and quality, especially in mainstream journals. While literature containing descriptions and stories about preparing teachers for diversity abounds (Ashton, 1996), reviewers of research claim that studies on practices for teachers and teacher education for diversity are relatively scarce (Brown, 1992; Grant, 1994; Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Zeichner, 1993).

Since the 1980s, the leaders of the multicultural teacher education movement have documented how they have reconceptualized their work (Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 1994). Larkin and Sleeter (1995) are at the forefront of this field and state that the central aim of multicultural teacher education is to develop in students the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for working with diverse learners. Though researchers have shown that it is possible for teacher education programs to help preservice teachers improve their dispositions toward diverse learners (Farber & Armaline, 1994; Ross & Smith, 1992), changing preservice teachers' tacit and often unquestioned beliefs about diverse learners can be a difficult prospect (McDiarmid, 1990; Paine, 1989).

One of the most highly regarded and effective strategies for helping preservice teachers develop the dispositions, knowledge, and skills for working with diverse learners is providing intensive, long term field experiences (Farber & Armaline, 1994; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996; Slick, 1995). Zeichner (1993) warns that this strategy is no panacea. When field experience is handled poorly, it is detrimental to the development of teachers who can work well with all types of

learners (Beyer, 1984; McDiarmid, 1990; McIntyre, Byrd,& Foxx, 1996). When field experiences with diverse learners are handled properly, the benefits are mutual for preservice teachers and the children with whom they work (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996).

An example of an early field experience with diverse learners provided for preservice teachers is the Bright Futures Mentoring Program at the University of Florida. Since the late 1980s, the Elementary Proteach Program at the University of Florida has undergone extensive reconfiguration coinciding with growing efforts to promote teacher education for equity and justice (see Ross, Johnson, & Smith, 1993). Revision of the core courses of Elementary Proteach revealed a need for an early field experience. The Bright Futures Mentoring (then called Tutoring) Program was designed to complement the evolving Elementary Proteach Program. Since 1990, all first semester preservice teachers in the Elementary Proteach Program at the University of Florida have been required to participate in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

Bright Futures is a collaborative effort of the University of Florida's elementary teacher education program (Elementary Proteach), the Gainesville (Florida) Housing Authority, and the Gainesville Police Department. Bright Futures was designed in part to help low income, African American children residing in public housing neighborhoods to succeed in school and to prepare largely white, female, middle class, prospective elementary school teachers to work well with a student population with whom they are unfamiliar (Bondy & Davis, in press). Grants from the United States

Department of Housing and Urban Development have supported Bright Futures since its inception.

Bright Futures consists of an early field experience pairing elementary preservice teachers with children who live in local public housing neighborhoods. The field experience takes place over 10 weeks of a 16-week semester. Each mentor is assigned to work with a child who lives in one of five public housing neighborhoods in which mentoring occurs. Mentoring sessions are scheduled biweekly for one hour and take place in a community center in each public housing neighborhood. Mentors are responsible for planning and implementing activities for sessions and receive feedback from experienced public school teachers assigned to each mentoring site. Since its inception, studies of the Bright Futures field experience have focused on its impact on preservice teachers (Bondy, Schmitz, & Johnson, 1993; Bondy, 1994; Bondy & Davis, 1996a, 1996b; Clark & Bondy, in press).

Bondy and colleagues (Bondy 1994, 1995; Bondy & Davis, 1996a, 1996b) have investigated questions about what lessons mentors learn from the Bright Futures experience, what mentoring is like for mentors, and how mentoring affects mentors' views on teaching and learning. Bondy (1994) found that mentors learn sociocultural lessons that include insights about poor minority children and their families, about different interactional styles, and understanding of and respect for culturally unfamiliar people (Bondy, 1994).

In addition to sociocultural learnings, Bondy (1994) found that mentors in Bright Futures learn important pedagogical lessons. Mentors learn what teaching is like, how to plan and organize, how to manage time and student

behavior, how to motivate children and focus on their interests, how to address different learning styles, how to work with children with disabilities, and how to apply strategies learned from course work (Bondy, 1994). From more recent research on Bright Futures, we know that many preservice teachers are able to maintain a positive, student-oriented focus and learn to use support mechanisms and resources in their efforts to teach the students assigned to them (Bondy & Davis, 1996b). Though many mentors consider themselves and their students to be strangers, recent research on Bright Futures shows that it is possible for mentors to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and caring disposition required for culturally relevant teaching (Bondy & Davis, in press).

Mentors who do not have positive experiences in Bright Futures still learn important lessons about teaching, such as how challenging it can be (Bondy & Davis, 1996a). However, mentors who do not establish relationships with their students tend to blame the children and families for their difficulties and tend to have negative reactions to mentoring. Negative mentors often seek commiseration partners and engage in cultural stereotyping (Bondy & Davis, 1996a). The danger in such activity is that cultural stereotypes may actually be reinforced by the field experience (Zeichner, 1993) as cultural clashes arise between the preservice teacher and the children.

Statement of the Problem

Teaching all children well stands as a primary aim of teacher education programs. However, pluralist teacher educators contend that teacher education perpetuates

educational and societal inequities by preparing teachers to work well only with children who have backgrounds similar to their own: predominantly white and middle class (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Multicultural teacher education aims to prepare teachers to work with all learners by providing both course work and experiences that focus on the needs of people who have been marginalized by what they contend is a racist, white male dominated society (Ladson-Billings, 1995b).

Preparing teachers to work with diverse learners is no easy prospect, and researchers suggest that current efforts to this end are not always successful (Gomez, 1993; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Zeichner, 1993). From research on multicultural teacher education, we know that extended, intensive field experience tends to help preservice teachers develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are conducive to effective teaching of diverse learners (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; McIntyre et al., 1996).

Research on the Bright Futures Mentoring Program provides insights into this early field experience for white, middle class, females working with African American children from local public housing neighborhoods. Clearly, many mentors have questions and concerns during the experience. In order to provide adequate support for mentors, it is important to know how they identify, define, and resolve mentoring dilemmas. Dilemmas have been defined as the complex daily problematic situations that arise from the common pedagogical problems faced by mentors which have no readily identifiable right answers (Lampert, 1985; Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993). Since all teaching situations are complex and dilemma-ridden sociál situations (Ross, Bondy, &

Kyle, 1993; Tom, 1984), and Bright Futures mentors undoubtedly encounter dilemmas, understanding how mentors identify, define, and resolve dilemmas will provide teacher educators with clues to how to design scaffolds of support.

The practice of placing preservice teachers in field experiences in unfamiliar cultural settings causes tension for white middle class preservice teachers learning to work with diverse learners (DeHart, 1992). Despite the fact that such student teacher practica are widely used and highly regarded as a time-tested tool for preparing teachers (Slick, 1995), we have little research that provides insights into what actually transpires in preservice teaching field experiences (Goodman, 1985; Zeichner, 1993).

The Bright Futures Mentoring Program at the University of Florida provides early field experience with diverse learners as a means to help preservice teachers begin to develop the intercultural competence essential to effective teaching (Bondy & Davis, 1996a). The problem is that we do not know is how mentors think about the dilemmas they encounter working with African American children. We need to know what dilemmas mentors face if we are to be effective in designing scaffolding to support them.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe how mentors experienced dilemmas working in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program with African American children and youths. Specifically, this study describes how mentors identified, defined, and resolved dilemmas in their early field experience. The following questions drove the study:

1. What dilemmas do white, female mentors identify as they work with African American children in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program?
2. How do mentors resolve dilemmas?

Rationale for the Study

The Bright Futures field experience is an example of a multicultural teacher education strategy aimed at helping preservice teachers learn to work well with diverse learners (Bondy, 1994). According to Schon (1983), programs like Bright Futures provide professional development contexts. In such contexts, preservice teachers often believe that they learn more than they do in their course work (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann 1987), while also encountering challenges to their perspectives. Encountering predicaments is conducive to reflection (Schon, 1983); therefore, it is likely that the dilemmas white preservice teachers face working with African American children act as catalysts for reflection (Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993). Few studies have been conducted that explore the dilemmas encountered in field experience by preservice teachers, especially when they participate in experiences in unfamiliar settings working with unfamiliar children (DeHart, 1992). This study adds to the literature on preparing teachers to work with diverse learners, especially in that it expands what is known about what field experiences are like for preservice teachers.

The practice of placing preservice teachers in field experiences in culturally unfamiliar settings often causes tension for white, middle class, preservice teachers learning to work with diverse learners (DeHart, 1992; Rice Jordan, 1995; Wolffe, 1996). It is likely that when white mentors in

Bright Futures encounter challenging situations working with African American children, these preservice teachers either reframe their views (Schon, 1983) or have their preconceived notions reinforced (Zeichner, 1993). Prior to this study, we knew little about how the mostly white, female mentors identified, defined and resolved dilemmas as they participated in Bright Futures and worked with African American children. The professional literature lacks research that documents preservice teachers' perceptions of what occurs during field experiences in which they work with diverse learners (Goodwin, 1997). Gaining insights into mentors' perceptions of dilemmas provides teacher educators with clues to how to design scaffolds of support for preservice teachers who participate in field experiences and work with diverse learners. The present study will describe how mentors experience dilemmas working in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program with African American children and youth. Specifically, this study illustrates how four mentors identified and resolved dilemmas in their early field experience.

Definition of Terms

Mentor. This term refers to the role played by first semester preservice Elementary Proteach students in the Bright Futures program. All four participants were bachelors degree candidates. Mentors act as guides, coaches, and teachers for children residing in public housing neighborhoods. Central to the mentoring role is the

development of relationships between the preservice teachers and the children with whom they work.

Diversity. This term will be used in its broadest denotation, which will encompass the views of Goodman (1992), who includes differences in race, gender, sexual orientation, social class, religion, and heritage, as well as Zeichner's (1993) attributes of culture, social class, language, and ethnicity. In Bright Futures, the diversity preservice teachers encounter tends to include race and socioeconomic status.

Multicultural Education. This term refers to efforts at reforming all dimensions of schooling to achieve equity and justice. The dimensions include curriculum, tracking and grouping, school staffing, testing, and improving student achievement without requiring assimilation of mainstream views. Multicultural education aims to make public education in the United States more accessible to children and youth from diverse backgrounds, cultures, races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, gender, and socioeconomic status.

Dilemmas. The kind of problems or problematic situations characterized by a pull or feeling of tension caused by cognitive dissonance combined with a change in emotional status.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research from the literature on multicultural teacher education provided the background for this study of the dilemmas encountered by preservice teachers in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. The review of the literature that follows provides overviews of the origins of multicultural education, the shortcomings of our current educational system, and multicultural teacher education. The review of research on practices in teacher education for diversity begins with an overview of the problem of demographic disparity between preservice teachers and the student population and then focuses on what teacher educators have done to prepare preservice teachers to work with diverse learners. As this study focused on the dilemmas of Bright Futures mentors, this chapter concludes with a discussion of Berlak and Berlak's (1981) research on dilemmas of schooling and the dilemma language used by classroom teachers. The Berlaks' (1981) theories about dilemma language and patterns of resolution guided the formation of research questions for the investigation and helped organize and analyze data.

Multiculturalism: A challenge for Teacher Educators

This nation was founded upon the idea that its government would be of, by, and for the people (Gutek, 1995). Such an aim is inherently democratic and pluralistic (Smeal, 1989). If one were to take these statements to their logical

conclusion, all people would be eligible to participate in democracy in the United States It seems that pluralism, the most essential premise of multiculturalism, may not have been on the minds of the founding fathers after all. In fact, the men who were responsible for establishing this nation used a very narrowly defined version of democracy. Proof of this exists in that slavery was tolerated and women were not given the right to vote.

Some progress was made toward rectifying the errors of the founding fathers before the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s; however, it took nearly 200 years before non-Europeans and females in this country began to have access to power and influence. During the 1950s, the federal government intervened to enforce the ruling on the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, and it became unconstitutional to separate people of color from their white peers in educational institutions (Grant & Sleeter, 1989). Such fundamental reforms moved our society toward pluralism and our educational system toward serving the needs of children from all cultures.

The period of the 1960s and 1970s has been characterized as a time of national introspection about social issues (Brown, 1992). Brown states that

> Some of this introspection was brought on by the high level of activity of minority groups and others in the continuing struggle for equal rights and cultural recognition. Eventually, white ethnic groups--most notably, eastern and southern Europeans--began to examine their own unique experiences in the United States and concluded, correctly, that much of their own histories and cultures was ignored in American education. Thus, they joined the movement toward culturally relevant education. (1992, p. 4)

The roots of the movement toward multicultural education may be traced to Congress passing the Ethnic Studies Act as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1972 (Banks & Banks, 1993). Following the passage of ESEA came additional acts that provided for equitable education programming for all children regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, or cultural heritage. Title IV and Title VII were Congressional initiatives for supporting multicultural, bilingual, and ethnic education (Banks & Banks, 1993; Brown, 1992).

As national attention to multicultural issues increased during the 1960s and 1970s, efforts to promote multicultural education also gained momentum. The progressive ideas of John Dewey found renewed popularity as educators sought methods of teaching that centered around inclusive theories of thinking, learning, and teaching (Cruickshank, 1987). Pluralist educators sought to bring education in line with the growing number of social programs enacted by the federal government in the 1960s and 1970s. Since that time, educators who favor making schooling more inclusive, sensitive to students' needs, and multicultural have struggled to gain support for their cause. Unfortunately, however, Brown (1992) finds that the progress made by educators toward multicultural education up to the 1990s lies mostly in their rhetoric. Despite theoretical and philosophical progress over the last two decades, not all educators embrace multiculturalism (Brown, 1992).

Critical theory scholars such as Apple (1990) suggest that it may not be possible to make the necessary progress toward pluralism and democracy in this country's educational

system because of hegemony. According to Apple, hegemony refers to "an organized assemblage of meanings and practices, the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions which are lived" (1990, p. 5). Hegemony exists in the covert and overt exercises in domination that saturate and permeate all of society. It becomes pervasive to the point that "people begin to consider the underlying assumptions of the dominant group to be common sense; it is a sense of reality for most people in the society" (Apple, 1990, p. 5).

Apple (1990) asserts that hegemony denies the attainment of cultural capital to oppressed groups. Cultural capital consists of whatever is the habitus of the dominant group or class. By habitus, Apple (1990) means

> what the dominant class considers to be in good taste, including the certain kinds of prior knowledge, abilities and language forms that are unequally distributed throughout society and . . . dependent in large part on the division of labor and power in that society. (p. 33)

Since European Americans comprise the dominant class and have the greatest influence over cultural capital, schools tend to reflect the values and power of patriarchal white society (Apple, 1990; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). In Ladson-Billing's and Tate's (1995) view, race is the determining factor of power in this society, and being white means having privilege and power. Such white dominance may be attributed to the economic and racial oppression that results from the control over schooling by what Delpit (1995) describes as the culture of power.

In Delpit's (1995) view, people of color are often denied access to the culture of power and the school success

of children of color has been severely limited in both overt and insidious ways. Educational success, asserts Delpit (1995), means gaining access to and sharing in the culture of power. Further, Delpit (1995) believes that becoming literate and successful requires that the codes of power, which comprise a hidden curriculum in our schools, be taught explicitly to students of color in order that they may gain access to the culture of power. In Delpit's (1995) view, teacher education must account for the needs of children of color to learn the codes of power because teachers are qualified to teach these codes. Doing otherwise, Delpit believes, ensures that children of color will not be able to participate fully in democracy. It is incumbent on teacher educators to help prospective teachers critically analyze the effects of white domination in schooling if children of color are going to have access to an equitable education (Ladson-Billings, 1996). Have teacher educators risen to this challenge?

According to scholars in the field of multicultural teacher education, developing a research base in this area has been a slow process (Grant, 1994; Grant & Secada, 1990; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Zeichner, 1993). Grant and Secada (1990) examined multicultural teacher education literature from 1973 to 1988 and initially found only 16 studies in this field. The range of the research on teacher education for diversity to 1994 was still quite narrow, with the majority of studies in this area focusing on pre- and inservice teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward diverse learners (Gomez, 1994; Grant, 1994). Efforts have been made to increase teachers' awareness of differences and contact with

students from diverse backgrounds; however, to 1988 there were no studies of how teacher attitudes affect practice (Grant & Secada, 1990).

Since their original review of the literature on teacher education for diversity in 1990, Grant and colleagues have reported an increase in the number of studies that have appeared in mainstream journals (27 additional studies by 1994). However, Grant (1994) notes that he found less than 50 studies of multicultural teacher preparation efforts in his review of the literature; when considering the total body of teacher education literature, this is a very small number.

To address the concern with teacher preparedness for diversity, the majority of teacher education research studies through 1994 focused on how teacher educators went about changing the dispositions, or attitudes, of preservice teachers (Grant, 1994; McDiarmid, 1992; Zeichner, 1993). teacher educators used course work and field experiences either together or separately for improving preservice teachers attitudes toward working with diverse learners. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that multiculturalism has been embraced by preservice teachers (Ladson-Billings, 1996). Grant (1981) noted that preservice teachers often pay lip service to what they learn in course work. In other words, preservice teachers often talk the multicultural talk but do not walk the multicultural walk.

Though increased attention is being paid to multiculturalism in teacher education literature, Haberman (1996) concludes that preservice teachers are not being well prepared to work well with diverse student populations. Zeichner (1993) contends that this stems from slow adoption

of multicultural orientations by teacher education programs. Some gains have been made, for example, in that classroom teachers have demonstrated abilities to pass mandated examinations that include standards for multicultural education (Banks & Banks, 1993); however, there has been little change in their abilities to teach diverse learners (Brown, 1992; Grant & Secada, 1990). Furthermore, diverse learners have not benefited significantly from efforts to prepare teachers to teach them (Brown, 1992).

Not all teacher educators hold such a grim outlook on the progress of multicultural teacher education. Sleeter and Grant (1994) suggest that growing numbers of teacher preparation programs have begun to adopt a multicultural education orientation. According to Sleeter and Grant (1988, 1994), there are at least five approaches to multicultural education commonly used by educational institutions in the United States: (a) Teaching the exceptional and culturally different, (b) Human relations, (c) Single-group studies, (d) Multicultural education, and (e) Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. The last is preferred by Sleeter and Grant (1988, 1994) as well as other influential teacher education scholars (Gomez, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Zeichner, 1993) who represent the leadership of the current movement toward multicultural teacher education which began in the 1980s.

A growing body of literature from the social reconstructionists addresses the aim of making of "a more just, equitable, and humane society" with a commitment to "furthering the common good" (Liston & Zeichner, 1991, p. 154). Social reconstructionist educators believe that

teachers can play a key role in fighting sexism, racism, poverty, capitalism, and poor working conditions (Liston & Zeichner, 1991). In the social reconstructionist view, these problems are at the core of educational inequities and teachers are charged with confronting biases, stereotypes, and racism head-on (Sleeter & Grant, 1994). Social reconstructionists posit that in order for non-mainstream and minority groups to receive an equitable education, teachers must not only adopt a social reconstructionist view, but also must foster these attitudes and beliefs in their students (Larkin, 1995). Gay (1996) states that "most advocates of multicultural education agree that its successful implementation in schools requires systematic and intentional change" (p. 53). If such fundamental change in schooling is to occur, the ways in which teachers are prepared must also change (Grant & Gomez, 1996).

What is the state of current efforts to prepare preservice teachers to work well with all learners? Before examining the ways in which teacher educators have gone about trying to improve preservice teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions toward diversity, two prior questions must be addressed: (a) Who are the students who make up the preservice teacher cohort in the United States, and (b) what do we know about their dispositions toward diversity as they enter their teacher preparation programs?

Preservice Teacher Cohort

The majority of the preservice teacher cohort in the United States is composed of white females from conservative middle to upper class backgrounds who have very limited experience with other races and cultures (Fuller & Ahler,

1987; Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1996; McCall, 1995). Haberman (1996) reports that the demographics of prospective teachers has remained unchanged for nearly two decades; preservice teachers are 94 percent white, 74 percent female, and overwhelmingly from rural and suburban areas. Few of them have had their previous schooling in urban areas, and fewer still express a desire to teach in urban schools (Haberman, 1996, p. 751). Studies show that white preservice teachers are often prejudiced and hold major misconceptions about other races (Finney & Orr, 1995; Gomez, 1993), believe that children of color are not capable of learning (Gomez, 1993; Goodlad, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Zeichner, 1993), and talk about multiculturalism superficially (Ross & Smith, 1992; Zeichner, 1993). Since many preservice teachers do not understand what multiculturalism entails and believe that they may not be able to learn adequately about other cultures, they tend to be uncertain how to incorporate multiculturalism into the classroom (Gomez, 1993; Harrington & Hathaway, 1995).

Preservice teachers typically have spent most of their lives in school and tend to be overly confident about their knowledge of school contexts and the work of the teacher (Richert, 1991). Richert (1991) found that as a result of this false confidence in their knowledge about schooling, preservice teachers are not likely to be reflective about the complexity that exists in todays classrooms. This is disturbing given the growing demographic gap between prospective teachers and school children.

White, middle class preservice teachers tend to hold conservative views about teaching and learning (McIntyre,

Byrd, & Foxx, 1996). That is, preservice teachers tend to adopt ways of teaching that are handed down as timeless traditions rather than aspiring to be innovators (Goodman, 1985; Goodman & Fish, 1997). Zeichner's (1993) study of the literature on teacher education for diversity led him to state that, for the most part, we do not know much about how preservice teachers develop their beliefs, cognitive abilities, and teaching skills. Zeichner's comments are not encouraging; however, it is important to note that a growing number of researchers report that some teacher educators are making headway toward improving preservice teachers' dispositions toward diversity (Farber & Armaline, 1994; Fry & McKinney, 1997; Ross & Smith, 1992).

Current Research on Multicultural Teacher Education: An Overview

Since Grant's (1994) review, several edited texts and book chapters devoted to multicultural teacher education have been published, including Larkin and Sleeter (1995), Martin (1995), Grant and Gomez (1996), as well as reviews in The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, Volume 2, by Haberman (1996) and Zeichner and Hoeft (1996). The comprehensive books and reviews listed above were used in defining the range of current efforts to prepare preservice teachers for diversity. Synthesis of this literature yields three kinds of practices that teacher educators use most often in teacher education for diversity.

One set of practices falls within the category of helping preservice teachers recognize their own perspectives and develop the capacity to understand and honor the perspectives of others (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996). Within

this theme, possibilities for improving dispositions or attitudes are explored (Grant & Gomez, 1996; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995), as well as how personal history affects preservice teachers' perspectives (Gillette, 1996; Martin, 1995). In some cases, developing perspectives includes increasing cultural knowledge (Larkin, 1995). Increasing cultural knowledge consists of teacher educators' efforts to build preservice teachers' knowledge about different cultures (Gillette, 1996; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Martin, 1995). Such efforts include having preservice teachers read about and study cultures other than their own to increase awareness of how other people live and view the world (Sleeter, 1995).

A second kind of practice is the simulation (Martin, 1995). This includes having preservice teachers act as researchers investigating racism, sexism, and other injustices (Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 1995) as well as how injustices are perpetuated in the media (Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Martin, 1995) and how personal histories are constructed (Larkin, 1995; Martin, 1995). Simulations also may involve having preservice teachers act out roles that portray aspects of the lives of oppressed people (Sleeter, 1995).

A third kind of practice is the field experience (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; Grant & Gomez, 1996; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Martin, 1995). Having preservice teachers engage in interactions with culturally different children is widely acknowledged by teacher educators to be a necessary component of a multicultural teacher education program (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; Larkin, 1995). Immersion in a culturally different context is the preferred approach (Armaline, 1995;

Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; Grant 1994; Martin, 1995). Often such field experiences occur early in teacher education programs and in conjunction with course work (Armaline, 1995). Programs commonly include service projects (Grant & Gomez, 1996; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995) and classroom teaching (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Martin, 1995).

The studies that follow indicate what is known about some of the possibilities and limits of multicultural teacher education. All of the studies reflect one or more of the kinds of practices presented above, especially developing preservice teachers' perspectives and use of field experience. These practices reflect the current efforts in the field of multicultural teacher education and will be used to draw parallels between early and contemporary research.

The studies were chosen for their similarities with the proposed study in terms of contextual factors, research questions, research methods, and combinations of these elements. The present study was an investigation of what occurs when white, female preservice teachers engage in multicultural course work and field experience. Since simulations are not part of the line of inquiry for the proposed study, no studies will appear here that reflect this theme (see Sleeter, 1995). Studies of field experience with diverse learners are the most closely related to the primary focus of this study; therefore, the review concludes with studies of this type.

The review focuses on summarizing the investigator's main questions, the demographics of the study participants, research methods, and significant findings. Together, the

summaries provide a backdrop for this study by describing how other teacher education researchers have investigated contexts similar to that experienced by mentors in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

Developing preservice teachers' perspectives

Teacher educators' early efforts to prepare teachers to work with all learners revolved around dispositional or attitudinal changes. Much of the early research on teacher education for diversity, that is, the research efforts noted in comprehensive reviews such as Zeichner's (1993) and Grant's (1994), focused on identifying and changing teacher attitudes toward diverse learners (Gomez, 1993; McDiarmid, 1992).

In an early study, Grant (1981) examined the quality and extent of multicultural learnings gleaned by 17 white elementary teacher education students (14 were women) from their preparation program that included at least one course with an intensive focus on education that is multicultural. All 17 students volunteered to be participants and by the end of the study had completed four semesters of their teacher education program. The focus of Grant's (1981) study balances course work and field experience as strategies that impact the developing perspectives of preservice teachers.

Grant (1981) constructed an interview inventory that was used to guide three intensive interviews. The same questions were asked in all three interviews. The questions asked participants to explore the instruction they received on planning and implementing multicultural curriculum, university assignments or projects they completed that were related to multicultural education, and the use of

multicultural concepts in the classroom, such as classroom planning and teaching strategies. Transcriptions of interviews served as the source of Grant's (1981) data.

The interview data were analyzed by research assistants who examined interview transcripts. Similar responses were recorded and tabulated in categories according to the focus of the corresponding interview questions. Three different individuals examined the data and cross checked the categories for accuracy and consistency.

Grant's (1981) report covers data gathered over four semesters. Participants discussed thirteen topics taken directly from the interview instrument. In two questions that relate to the proposed study, Grant (1981) asked whether assistance had been provided to the participants for incorporating education that is multicultural (EMC) into their student teaching plans and if anyone had discussed how to adapt teaching strategies to diverse learners. By the third interview, the greatest number of affirmative responses about incorporating EMC into classroom planning was six out of thirteen. Participants indicated that cooperating teachers had influenced their decision making, often discouraging the incorporation of EMC because there was no need or not enough time (Grant, 1981 p. 98). As a result, the student teachers often adopted the views of their cooperating teachers. Grant's (1981) data suggest a confounding problem. Thirteen out of sixteen of his informants had not received any more instruction in EMC than they had in their first semester by the end of the fourth semester.

Not all of Grant's (1981) findings were so disheartening. A majority of Grant's (1981) informants indicated by the third interview that someone had discussed with them how to adapt teaching strategies to students' learning styles. Informants credited their methods course instructors and student teaching seminar leaders with having helped them to account for students learning styles. When informants reported that they did not adapt their teaching to students' learning styles, they noted that they were not allowed the freedom to try such an approach in their student teaching practicum.

Grant (1981) concludes that his informants' responses reflect the low priority given to incorporating EMC by classroom teachers and faculty in the college of education. This pattern emerged as Grant (1981) analyzed informants' responses in which they noted repeatedly that there was "not enough time and often no need" (p. 98) for incorporating EMC. The informants seemed to adopt the views of their fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers, a prevalent theme noted in the reviews of Lanier and Little (1986) and Zeichner (1993). Grant (1981) contends that such outcomes indicate that teacher preparation programs are actually perpetuating the biases many preservice teachers bring with them. His recommendations include addressing human diversity explicitly throughout all course work and field experience; in other words, making EMC an integral part of all teacher preparation efforts. Specifically, Grant (1981) challenges teacher educators to promote critical thinking about social issues, no longer separating teacher preparation from the ethical, moral, and political realities of human diversity.

Ross and Smith (1992) studied preservice teachers perspectives on diversity as they begin placements in classrooms and encounter diverse learners; in this study, the field experience is one influence on the developing perspectives of the preservice teachers. This positions Ross and Smith (1992) with teacher educators who have conducted studies on the development of preservice teachers' perspectives and field experience; however, this investigation is not a study of the preservice teachers field experiences.

The six preservice teachers who served as Ross and Smith's (1992) informants were white, five were female, and all were enrolled in the Research in Elementary Education course in the Elementary Proteach program at the University of Florida. Six case studies were conducted to illuminate the preservice teachers' views of what it is like to teach diverse learners, how beliefs about disparities between expectations and children's achievement are formed, and to what degree commitments to teaching diverse learners are present. Ross and Smith (1992) examined written artifacts, field notes from classroom observations, and transcripts from two interviews. All data were analyzed using Spradley's (1979) methods of domain, taxonomic, and thematic analysis. Themes that emerged from data analyses helped in the construction of the case studies.

The findings of this study were that all six students had begun constructing knowledge and gaining a more complex perspective on teaching diverse learners. The students varied in the degrees of complexity and knowledge constructed

with regard to diversity issues; though all were viewed as having made progress, two students had very limited growth. Ross and Smith (1992) conclude that "teacher education programs, even within monocultural institutions, may be able to help many students develop the knowledge and attitudes necessary to work with multicultural students" (p. 101).

Bondy, Schmitz, and Johnson (1993) conducted studies concurrent with Ross and Smith (1992). Like Ross and Smith (1992), Bondy et al. (1993) may be positioned with teacher educators who study the development of preservice teachers dispositions toward diversity as they participate in course work and field experience. This study also echoes Ross and Smith's (1992) focus on field experience as an influence on the preservice teachers developing perspectives; the study does not include an investigation of the field experience itself.

Bondy et al. (1993) present two quantitative studies completed over two calendar years in succession, 1990 and 1991, as the Research in Elementary Education course, EDE 3481, was revised and changes in field experience components of Proteach evolved. Like Ross and Smith (1992), the participants in Bondy et al. (1993) were mostly white, middle-class females. In the first study of Bondy et al. (1993), 184 students participated, while 157 students participated in the second study. The two studies are distinct in that study #1 focuses primarily on the Research course and its impact on students' perspectives. Study #2 aimed at finding out what combination of course work and field experience has the most impact on changing

perspectives. Together, these studies provide insights into how course work and fieldwork interact to help preservice teachers develop their perspectives toward diversity.

The first study investigated the impact of updating the Research course to deal more explicitly with issues related to teaching diverse learners (p. 57). Bondy et al. (1993) wanted to know how changes in course content affect preservice teachers' responses on an instrument that focuses on beliefs about diversity issues. Statistical data were gathered from two inventories that were considered pre- and posttests, both of which were completed by the students. Treatment and control groups were employed. Results from ANCOVA and ANOVA procedures show a strong relationship between taking the revised Research course and having a broader, more complex view of diversity. In one semester, the students who took the revised Research course while they tutored youth in local public housing neighborhoods "showed significant growth in their view of diversity and adopted a more complex view of the causes and consequences of being different" (Bondy et al., 1993 p. 61).

The second study of Bondy et al. (1993) sought to discover if students' beliefs about diversity were impacted by the Research course that focused on teaching diverse learners. Bondy et al. (1993) found that the students who took the Research course and tutored showed significant growth in their views of diversity, while students who tutored without taking the course did not. This experiment verifies that the combination of guided experience in the field and dealing with diversity issues in course work has a

positive impact on preservice teachers' views of diverse learners.

Beyer's (1991) study illuminates the importance of helping students generate and clarify commitments through the use of dissonant situations and time for reflection in preservice teacher education programs. Beyer's (1991) study encompasses two kinds of multicultural teacher education strategies: developing preservice teachers' perspectives and fieldwork. Beyer's (1991) inquiry focuses on how three white preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity changed as they took his foundations of education course called School and Society and participated in a human service project.

Beyer (1991) collected data from journals students kept and found that preservice teachers' entering perspectives, preexisting commitments, and beliefs about social, political, and economic issues determine the extent to which experiences with diverse learners will affect them. The journals contained observation data, records of emotional reactions, and thoughts about the connections between field experiences and the School and Society course. Beyer (1991) collected the journals and used verbatim samples in construction of narratives about the preservice teachers' experience.

Two of the three preservice teachers studied began the course and field experience without clear commitments about social, political, and economic issues. The project and course work provided significant experiences for these two preservice teachers, but it was unclear whether the experiences had significant impact on their commitments. Beyer (1991) found clear evidence of impact on the commitments of the student who entered the project and course

with a well thought-out theoretical framework; in other words, this student had some clear commitments about social, political, and economic issues. Beyer (1991) asserts that this student's theoretical framework "helped her to derive meanings from field experience situations that would not otherwise have been evident" (p. 127). Beyer's (1991) study demonstrates that reflection in course work can be effective, but that preservice teachers' entering perspectives, beliefs, and frameworks have a great impact on the degree of success of the course.

Beyer (1991) suggests that we must provide dissonant situations and time for reflection in preservice teacher education programs. We cannot count on students entering teacher preparation programs with frameworks that will help them to understand their course and field work. Gomez (1993) offers a similar suggestion, that "sometimes it is necessary for students to experience some level of discomfort or dissonance in order for them to reach new stages of learning and change" (p. 468).

As Beyer (1991) notes, it helps if preservice teachers enter their programs with a commitment to teach all learners, but even those with less than solid commitments can be helped to change their perspectives (Ross & Smith, 1992; Bondy, Schmitz, & Johnson, 1993). Other researchers (Ross & Smith, 1992) report success with preservice teachers with varying levels of commitment and note that the corresponding knowledge they construct will also vary in complexity.

Armaline (1995) studied the practice of developing perspectives as preservice teachers participated in a unique field experience. Armaline's (1995) position is similar to

Beyer's (1991) on the use of planned reflective discussion in course work that focuses on field experiences with diverse learners; both believe that this combination of experiences increases the likelihood that preservice teachers will look critically at their beliefs.

Armaline (1995) studied equally mixed experimental and comparison groups of 28 traditional and nontraditional female and male preservice teachers; a total of 56 preservice teachers participated in the study. Data were gathered from both groups of preservice teachers' journals in which they provided narrative accounts of their experiences in urban classrooms. Data were also gathered during course discussions for the experimental group aimed at promoting reflective dialogue. All of the participants were "either in their first or second semester in their teacher education program. The comparison group was assigned to classrooms in urban settings and assigned the journal task. The comparison group did not participate in reflective sessions" (Armaline, 1995 p. 174).

Armaline (1995) constructed a coding system for journal entries based on three criteria: (a) the number and types of problems preservice teachers generated; (b) the degree to which the entry indicates that the writer "engaged in the phases of reflective thinking" (p. 169); and (c) how deeply the preservice teachers analyzed the situations described in the entries. Preservice teachers in the experimental group who participated in reflective sessions following field experiences with diverse learners tended to write longer, more detailed journal entries, and were more likely to analyze and apply issues that impact children's success in

school than preservice teachers in the control group (Armaline, 1995). For example, one preservice teacher from the experimental group described a situation in which a cooperating teacher with whom the preservice teacher was placed visited the home of a child. The child had been in a fight at school. The preservice teacher noted the condition of the building where the child lived, her emotional reactions to the horrendous living conditions, and how she felt completely unprepared for such an environment. She was indeed an outsider. Of particular importance was that the preservice teacher noted that she had learned a valuable lesson about the lives of children whose backgrounds were different from her own and that she could "understand a little more what they've grown up with and continue to live with" (Armaline 1995, p.174).

Armaline (1995) notes that preservice teachers who were given more opportunities to reflect systematically and over time "analyzed themselves more deeply in regard to understanding differences between their own culture and those of the students with whom they worked in the field. This was especially true for racial differences" (p. 172). According to Armaline (1995), in order to increase the likelihood that preservice teachers will construct understandings from "cultural clashes" (p. 174) with culturally different children in the field, opportunities to engage in active dialogue are required. Such dialogue becomes a necessity the more demographically different preservice teachers are from the children with whom they work in the field. The reason for this is that discussions of cultural clashes that occur in field experiences evoke dissonance, which prompts

preservice teachers to discuss their beliefs about diversity and practice thinking critically in their course work. Such discussion provides an opportunity for preservice teachers to compare their lives with the lives of children who are culturally different. What do we know from research about the impact of preservice teacher education field experiences with culturally different children?

Field experience

Larke's (1990) study examines the effects of teacher education strategies aimed at improving attitudes toward diversity and includes the practices of developing perspectives and employing field experience. In this investigation, 51 preservice elementary teachers, 46 of whom were white and five were Mexican American, completed a survey after participating in a mentorship project as part of their field experience and taking a multicultural education course. The preservice teachers completed a 28 item agree/disagree questionnaire that addressed "general cultural awareness, the family, communication, assessments and multicultural methods and materials" (p. 24). Larke (1990) analyzed survey responses as they fell into categories about general cultural awareness, culturally diverse families, cross-cultural communication, assessment, and the multicultural environment. Data were reported in tables of statistics as to the percentages of preservice teachers responses that were in agreement or disagreement.

Results of the study indicate that "sensitivity was increased to varying degrees by the course work in which they received human relations training that emphasizes the concerns of the culturally diverse student" (Larke, 1990, p.

24). The most positive increases were evident in the area of preservice teachers' realization that they will encounter diverse learners when they begin teaching. Preservice teachers were found to favor parent participation in decision making about educational matters and demonstrated willingness to adapt assessment to accommodate diverse learners. Combined, these findings indicate that a field experience can improve preservice teachers' awareness of and attitudes toward diversity.

Accompanying Larke's (1990) findings was some evidence that the experiences of working with a culturally different child and taking a multicultural education course by themselves do not seem to improve sensitivity in some areas. For example, the preservice teachers did not accept the non-standard English spoken by the children in the mentoring program. Also, many preservice teachers did not object to the use of ethnic jokes and racial statements. Larke (1990) surmised that "about half of the preservice teachers did not believe that cultural knowledge will affect a teacher's expectation of students" (p. 28). Larke (1990) notes that while efforts to improve preservice teachers' sensitivity can have positive effects, the matter of improving attitudes over all is a complex task. The most reassuring of Larke's (1990) findings corresponds with research advocating the use of dissonant field experiences (Gomez, 1993; Greenman & Kimmel, 1995). When combined with opportunities for discussion and reflection, course work and fieldwork that include cultural dissonance offer a great deal of promise for teacher education programs focusing on diversity. Such dissonance is useful for promoting reflection (Greenman & Kimmel, 1995).

Bondy and Schmitz (1991) studied the field experiences of eight white preservice teachers who participated concurrently in the Bright Futures Tutoring Program and the Research in Elementary Education course, EDE 3481. The preservice teachers tutored low income, African American children residing in public housing neighborhoods (Bondy, 1994). Eight tutors were interviewed during one semester. Some of the tutors were enrolled in the Research course, which includes a unit of study on diversity. Data were collected from tutor interviews conducted throughout one semester, and themes were identified with regard to their experiences in Bright Futures.

Tutors who took the Research course found the experience of tutoring to be challenging, yet remained open minded toward teaching diverse learners. By comparison, the experience seemed counterproductive for tutors who did not take the Research course. According to Bondy and Schmitz (1991), the experiences of the tutors who did not take the Research course appeared to have a negative impact on their attitudes toward diverse learners. Bondy and Schmitz (1991) speculate that the tutors who were enrolled in the Research course had positive reactions to diversity as a result of having dealt with diversity issues in course work and discussions. Bondy (1994) explains that these findings corroborate Grant and Secada's (1990) recommendation for providing courses for preservice teachers that afford both "support mechanisms and some contexts within which to interpret their experiences" (p. 418).

DeHart's (1992) study focused on studying how preservice teachers managed dilemmas as they worked with children in a

computer laboratory located in a minority neighborhood. All four of the participants were white, middle class preservice teachers. This study is distinct from others in this review in that the informants were enrolled in teacher education course work while they completed the field experience; however, none of the students was enrolled in a common course, nor were they enrolled in a multicultural education course during the study. DeHart's (1992) investigation is consistent with the practice of using field experience as a venue for studying preservice teachers' perspectives on adapting curriculum for diverse learners.

DeHart (1992) studied the dilemmas of preservice teachers who worked in the East Lakeside Neighborhood Center (ELNC) in urban Madison, Wisconsin. The computer laboratory in which preservice teachers provided computer literacy instruction for African American children was located in a public housing project. DeHart used Berlak and Berlak's (1981) definition of dilemma derived from their study of "the daily problems of schooling" (p. 3). The Berlaks contend that teachers "organize the problems they encounter in teaching as a set of concepts" (p. 22) that represent the complexity inherent in classrooms.

DeHart (1992) gathered data on the preservice teachers' dilemmas from field observations, informal interviews and artifacts produced in the ELNC computer laboratory by the preservice teachers paired with children from the immediate neighborhood. DeHart (1992) observed and recorded field notes as the preservice teachers worked with the children. All four preservice teachers kept journals, as did the

investigator, and these journals provided another source of data. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and the investigator took notes in numerous informal interviews. Artifacts such as lesson plans and ELNC newsletters were also collected. DeHart (1992) examined data for the purpose of "capturing the dynamic social events" (p. 66) that would provide rich data for the case studies she constructed.

DeHart (1992) followed Merriam's (1988) suggestions for three levels of data analysis. She organized raw data into a data base that served as the foundation for writing narrative accounts and the first level of analysis. The second level of data analysis consisted of development of categories and themes. Once themes emerged, interpretation of meanings proceeded. The third level of data analysis consisted of defining dilemma categories, listing the properties of the dilemmas, and then looking for connections within and between dilemmas. Making such connections helped the investigator form tentative hypotheses. According to Merriam (1988), forming hypotheses is essential in order to move the researcher toward a theory that may explain what the pre-service teachers do and how they attach meanings to their actions.

Six dilemmas from three of the Berlaks' (1981) categories emerged from DeHart's (1992) analysis of data on four preservice teachers whose stories about their experiences were reported as case studies. The first category of dilemmas includes problems associated with implementing the computer curriculum of the program. The

preservice teachers found themselves torn between what they perceived as required material and what they believed was extraneous. The preservice teachers also struggled with deciding whether to merely tutor the children at the center and focus on computer skills or to use the computers as tools in efforts to empower the children.

The second category of DeHart's (1992) dilemmas includes problems from the Berlaks' (1981) set of cultural dilemmas. The preservice teachers encountered difficulties working with children whose backgrounds were different from their own. DeHart (1992) notes that the preservice teachers felt tension as they struggled to reconcile what they considered to be mainstream culture and the differing worldviews of the neighborhood children.

The third of DeHart's (1992) categories of dilemmas includes problems with the organizational structure of an educational setting. The preservice teachers struggled to separate their notions of what schools are like from the collaboratively structured computer center. DeHart (1992) found that the preservice teachers believed that someone had to be in charge and struggled to decide whether to take charge themselves or allow the child to do so. A reoccurring theme in this domain was the tension preservice teachers perceived between being a responsive helper or an authoritative tutor.

Bondy and colleagues (Bondy, 1994; Bondy & Davis, 1996b) have made the Bright Futures Mentoring Program the subject of ongoing research on the lessons learned by and roles mentoring plays for preservice teachers. Bondy has studied

Bright Futures since its inception in 1990 (Bright Futures was described in Chapter One).

Bondy (1994) collected written feedback from 130 mostly white, middle or upper middle class, female tutors and analyzed data using Spradley's (1980) analytic process; the investigator collected data, organized it into domains, and then looked for themes in the preservice teachers words. According to Bondy (1994), tutors' learnings from their Bright Futures experiences fall into two categories: sociocultural learning and pedagogical learning. Sociocultural learning refers to tutors' insights about their pupils' values, culture, community, and interactional styles (Bondy, 1994). Sociocultural learnings helped tutors be more sensitive, responsive, and understanding about differences between themselves and the children with whom they worked in this early field experience.

Bondy's (1994) category of pedagogical learning provides insights about how preservice teachers construct definitions of teaching. Bondy (1994) found that tutors in Bright Futures gained insights about pedagogical issues. These include planning, time management, motivating pupils, developing interpersonal and social skills, and awareness of the importance of knowing children. The scope of the preservice teachers' attempts to make appropriate pedagogical decisions seems to be connected to their perceptions of the aims of Bright Futures; Bondy's (1994) informants defined their roles in different ways and pedagogical learnings varied.

Ongoing study of Bright Futures has resulted in studies that provide teacher educators with insights into how they

can provide scaffolding for preservice teachers who participate in early field experiences with diverse learners. Bondy and Davis (1996b) collected data from ethnographic interviews conducted during the Bright Futures tutoring experience and then several semesters later as the five participants were completing their preparation program. From the inception of Bright Futures in 1990, the preservice teachers who participated in the program were called tutors. Since Fall Semester, 1996, participants in Bright Futures have been called mentors.

Interviews were conducted while the preservice teachers participated in Bright Futures. Two years later, the preservice teachers were asked to read the transcripts of their early interviews and respond to them. The preservice teachers were asked to reflect on the significance of tutoring in their development as teachers (Bondy & Davis, 1996b). Data analysis was guided by the analytic process described by Spradley (1980). Interview transcripts were analyzed for domains of related terms. Examination of the retrospective interviews yielded several roles that tutoring played in shaping the preservice teachers' thinking about teaching and learning.

As in DeHart's (1992) study, Bondy and Davis (1996b) found that the function a field experience serves for preservice teachers is determined in part by their perceptions of the aims of the program and how they are to work toward those aims. For two tutors whose commitment to teaching was shaky, working one-on-one with an African-American child was a "litmus test" (Bondy & Davis, 1996b, p.5) in that it helped them determine whether teaching was

the right career choice. According to Bondy and Davis (1996b), the questions behind the litmus test include do I want to teach? or will I be able to teach? Two tutors with a more clear commitment to teaching described the function tutoring played in "setting the stage" (Bondy & Davis, 1996b, p. 8) for the remainder of their teacher education program. These tutors posed questions about learning and teaching and were clearly interested in finding answers in subsequent course work; for these preservice teachers, tutoring served as a point of reference as they took courses and thought about educational issues. One tutor seemed committed to becoming a teacher, yet had a negative view of her experiences in tutoring considered Bright Futures an endurance test (Bondy & Davis, 1996b, p. 6). For her, tutoring was a waste of time and an anomaly that would eventually pass. This tutor considered tutoring irrelevant.

According to Bondy and Davis (1996b), two functions of tutoring readily apparent in the words of all of the informants involved gaining insights about the importance of knowing children. All of the informants realized that knowing the child they tutored was important; however, the kinds of knowing differed. Two of the preservice teachers focused on psychological concerns including personality, interests, skills and cognitions. A few tutors had a sociological emphasis in which they wondered about how their tutee lived and negotiated the realities of the community.

To some degree, all of the tutors Bondy and Davis (1996b) interviewed reconsidered their beliefs about children, families, and teaching. The preservice teachers claimed that tutoring helped them with knowing children,

challenged their assumptions, and helped them to know more about culturally different people. In particular, all informants were more enlightened about differences between their own and their tutee's culture and life experiences. Tutors described being surprised that some of their assumptions were completely erroneous and, in some cases, were shocked to find that tutees had high expectations for themselves. Bondy and Davis (1996b) conclude that early field experiences with culturally different children have the potential for altering preservice teachers' understanding of minority peoples lives.

In summary, we know that the demographics of the preservice teacher population is dominated by white, middle class, females who have little experience with people who are different. Teacher educators concerned with preparing teachers to work well with all learners rely on strategies such as developing perspectives through course work and field experience, immersing preservice teachers in field experiences in culturally different settings, and using simulations in course work. All of these strategies are aimed at helping teachers combat the inequities in our current educational system. Contemporary publications by scholars from the field of multicultural teacher education have noted these trends, and through examination of the studies mentioned above, several more seem apparent and are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The first trend is that teacher educators who prepare preservice teachers to work with diverse learners have begun to emphasize providing field experiences with culturally different children as early as the first semester of the

teacher preparation program (Armaline, 1995; Bondy & Davis, 1996b). As Grant (1981) notes, preservice teachers need as much time in such field experiences as they can get.

The second trend is that teacher educators for diversity tend to balance the main factors influencing preservice teachers' perspective taking namely, course work and field experience. This means that teacher educators, whether by design or by intuition, prefer having preservice teachers working in the field simultaneously while engaging in course work with a university supervisor. As suggested by Gomez (1993), prospective teachers need careful supervision when confronting unfamiliar people and situations in order that preexisting biases are not reinforced.

The third trend is that teacher educators concerned with multicultural education have begun to refer to the notion of dilemmas as the catalysts for reflective thinking and points of opportunity for interventions as preservice teachers work with diverse learners (DeHart, 1992; Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993).

The fourth trend suggests that in order for dilemmas to have the optimum effect, dissonance must be present (Beyer, 1991; Gomez, 1993; Larke, 1990). Preservice teachers are not likely to take perspectives of those they consider as others (Gomez, 1993; Delpit, 1995) until they themselves experience feeling what it is like to be an other. Such feelings cause dissonance, which is a sense of disjointedness and uneasiness that can help preservice teachers see the reasons for engaging in critical reflection.

The fifth trend is that reflection exists as both an aim and a process of teacher education, especially when the aim

of such efforts is to prepare teachers for diversity (Armaline, 1995; Farber & Armaline, 1994; Ross et al., 1993). Reflection surfaces frequently in the multicultural teacher education literature (Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Martin, 1995) and has been touted as a much needed strategy for preparing teachers for diversity (Gomez, 1993).

The final trend is that qualitative research methods are preferred by teacher educators who study field experiences that place preservice teachers with diverse learners. Qualitative methods of investigation are well suited to inquiry about complex teaching and learning situations. In particular, case study is often employed, since the researchers desire to paint authentic and vivid pictures of the complexity surrounding preservice teachers as they engage in course work and field experience.

Studies of field experiences have helped teacher educators become more aware of how preservice teachers experience fieldwork, yet little is known about what preservice teachers actually do once they begin working with diverse learners in field experiences (Zeichner, 1993). The present study was conducted to provide insights about the dilemmas Bright Futures mentors encounter and how they resolve dilemmas. Gaining insights about mentors' perceptions of dilemmas can help teacher educators provide support for preservice teachers in field experiences with diverse learners.

Berlak and Berlak's (1981) framework: Dilemmas and dilemma lanquage

Berlak and Berlak's (1981) investigation provides the foundational research that inspired the present study. Their

theory of dilemma language served as the guiding framework as this study evolved. The Berlaks spent six months investigating how open schools in England were run differently from schools in the United States In their sociological study, the Berlaks (1981) used ethnographic methods of observation and interviewing to illuminate the relationship of the mundane, the ordinary--and sometimes unusual--events of everyday school life to the significant broader concerns of social and economic justice, and the quality of life (p. 3). The investigators wanted to accurately describe the complex happenings in classrooms that could not be classified according to neat categories such as teacher-centered or democratic. The Berlaks found that they needed a way to describe the "variations, regularities and apparent contradictions" (1981 p. 108) that they observed in the 19 English schools in which they conducted observations.

In constructing the framework of dilemmas that form the basis of their dilemma language, the Berlaks (1981) referred to data from extensive field notes in which they recorded "daily events, words of children and school staff, personal impressions, questions and judgments" (p.38). They also interviewed 10 school heads, 18 teachers, and 27 children. The resulting 16 dilemmas, organized into three sets, represent both "the range and complexity of daily life in classrooms that can be ordered by the dilemma language" (p. 38). This dilemma language allowed the Berlaks (1981) to preserve the reality of contradictory teacher behavior that is often present in classrooms; such behavior is sometimes conscious and deliberate and at other times tacit and mindlessly habitual.

Inquiry into the dilemmas teachers face serves a practical purpose. In order to perceive alternative courses of action, one must "explore and clarify the origins and consequences of the schooling process upon children and its contribution to social and cultural reproduction and change" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p. 135). The Berlaks' (1981) first set of dilemmas includes classroom control dilemmas. By control, the Berlaks (1981) mean the power exerted by teachers in the classroom. Control dilemmas refer to the differences in both the "locus and extent of classroom control" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p. 136). The control dilemmas are as follows:

1. Whole child v. child as student--(realms)
2. Teacher v. child control--(time)
3. Teacher v. child control--(operations)
4. Teacher v. child control--(standards)

The utility of the four control dilemmas is that they may be applied to practical or research questions about teachers and children. The Berlaks use their control dilemmas as the descriptors for each axis (horizontal and vertical) on a four quadrant grid when describing their findings from classroom observations. By plotting a teacher's dilemma resolutions on such a grid, one can see patterns of resolution emerge over time.

The second set of the Berlaks' (1981) dilemmas is the curriculum set. The curriculum set includes indications of how teachers transmit the knowledge and ways of knowing of their culture. The dilemmas of curriculum derived by the Berlaks (1981) include

5. Personal knowledge v. public knowledge

6. Knowledge as content v. knowledge as process
7. Knowledge as given v. knowledge as problematical
8. Learning as holistic v. learning as molecular
9. Intrinsic v. extrinsic motivation
10. Each child unique v. children have shared characteristics
11. Learning is individual v. learning is social
12. Child as person v. child as client

According to the Berlaks (1981), each of the curriculum dilemmas represents a set of ideas that create tension for teachers as each pole of the dilemma exerts some degree of pull on teachers' beliefs and judgments. The utility of noting the degree of emphasis a teacher places on one side or the other of a curriculum dilemma is that one can see patterns in the ways a teacher goes about deciding what is valuable for her students to learn. Noting the degrees of emphasis a teacher places on curriculum dilemmas may also indicate her biases toward her students.

The societal set of dilemmas focus on "contradictions in schooling patterns related to equality, justice and social relations between the ages, sexes, and ethnic and racial groups" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p. 135). The factors that the Berlaks (1981) refer to as societal are "the conceptions of childhood, the allocation of resources, the definition and control of deviants, and the relations of sub-groups to the more dominant groups in society" (p. 156). The societal set of dilemmas includes

13. Childhood continuous v. childhood unique (childhood)
14. Equal allocation of resources v. differential allocation (allocation)

15. Equal justice under law v. ad hoc application of rules (deviance)

16. Common culture v. sub-group consciousness

As the role of the teacher is quite complex, so too are the dilemmas teachers encounter. Therefore, as teachers experience tension because of pulls on their beliefs, the influence of society may be felt explicitly or implicitly depending on the individual and the situation; the Berlaks (1981) contend that the influence of society is always present.

The Berlaks (1981) stress that the social and curriculum sets of dilemmas are not necessarily distinct; the line dividing the curriculum of a school from the society that supports it is quite fuzzy. In fact, the Berlaks (1981) caution against using the dilemmas alone as lenses for examining teaching situations. Rather, the Berlaks suggest "viewing the patterns of a teacher through one, several or all the dilemmas simultaneously" (1981, p. 136). The utility of examining a teaching situation using one of the social dilemmas, for example, could be to note changes over time in a teacher's behaviors with regard to a particular dilemma. The Berlaks (1981) note that this use of one dilemma is "a distortion of the reality and flux of classroom life" (p. 164), yet it can be helpful in the preliminary stages of a study. Learning about specific dilemmas in depth may also be necessary before attempting to look at all of the dilemmas affecting a teaching situation at once.

Chapter 3 will provide a description of how the Berlaks' (1981) dilemma language was used as a starting point as research questions were formulated and data were

collected and analyzed; however, as this study evolved, the Berlaks' dilemma language terminology was abandoned in favor of terms that were used by the participants in the study. That is not to say the Berlaks' framework was abandoned; rather, terms that fit most closely with the context of Bright Futures mentors were substituted for terms used by the Berlaks to describe the British teachers' dilemmas and "patterns of resolution" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p. 132).

This study builds upon the work of teacher education researchers who inquire about the impact of early field experiences, especially when preservice teachers are immersed in unfamiliar situations and work with culturally different children. By providing insights about such early field experience, this study helps teacher educators design course work and field experiences to prepare preservice teachers to work with diverse learners.

The present study extends Berlak and Berlak's (1981) conception of dilemmas as they relate to the unique early field experiences of white middle class female preservice teachers paired with children who reside in public housing neighborhoods. The study contributes to what is known about the process that preservice teachers employ in working through and resolving dilemmas in student teaching. Such knowledge is crucial for teacher educators who want to be well informed as they design scaffolds of support for preservice teachers in field experiences like Bright Futures.

Summary

This chapter contains a review of the literature on the rise of the multicultural education movement and

corresponding developments in multicultural teacher education. Multicultural education and multicultural teacher education both aim to provide more equitable educational opportunities for all children regardless of gender, race, culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status or sexual orientation. Proponents of multicultural education contend that American public schools reflect the hegemony that has marginalized children of color. Efforts at changing this have proven especially challenging for teacher educators whose students are predominantly white, middle class females.

Research and discourse on diversity issues in teacher education have not increased proportionately with the steady increase in the numbers of diverse learners in our public schools. There is also a disproportionate number of white, middle class females who comprising both preservice and inservice teaching cohorts. Experts in the field of teacher education for diversity call the state of things a crisis. Researchers claim that the crisis is exacerbated as teachers tend not to embrace multiculturalism. Moreover, children of color are not reaping the benefits of more than a decade of multicultural teacher education. Though not all of the research has yielded grim findings on teacher education for diversity, the overall outlook is discouraging.

In response to calls for improvements in teacher education for diversity, experts have made recommendations of proven strategies for preparing teachers to work well with diverse learners. The first strategy is having preservice teachers surface their beliefs and perspectives on diversity issues through talking, reading, and writing about oppression, which helps them confront the often tacit belief

systems they bring to their programs. Simulations are useful for providing experiences and the dissonance that is often required in order for teachers to question their beliefs; actually feeling what it is like to be marginalized by others helps teachers understand how their students feel when they are victims of oppression. Finally, the most powerful intervention for changing preservice teachers' attitudes and practices is field experience that requires them to work directly with diverse learners.

The review of literature conducted for this study has synthesized the findings of studies from teacher education for diversity and yielded six conclusions about the current status of research in the field. The first conclusion was that the amount of time spent in field experiences has been increased and preservice teachers are receiving such programming from their first semesters in their preparation programs. Second, teacher educators are choosing to teach courses and supervise their students in field experiences during the same semester. Third, dilemmas have emerged as necessary and positive catalysts for promoting reflectivity as preservice teachers complete field experiences. Fourth, courses and field experiences that build in dissonance for promoting reflection tend to enhance preservice teachers' learning. Such reflection is the fifth strategy, which is an aim of many current teacher education programs: to produce reflective teachers. Finally, teacher educators for diversity have begun to emphasize the use of qualitative methods for research as it is well-suited to studies of complex, dilemma-ridden contexts like schools and classrooms. Together, these conclusions indicated the need for conducting

this in-depth study of four white, middle class, female preservice teachers who worked with low socioeconomic status black children in the Bright Futures Mentoring field experience. This study is needed by teacher educators and others whose aims are to provide the most productive experiences possible for preservice teachers. In particular, this study of mentoring dilemmas delved into the depths of the problems that were the most compelling to the four participants. Knowing details about how the four participants experienced dilemmas offers a unique opportunity to see the problems of an early field experience through the eyes of four preservice teachers.

This study extends the pioneering investigation of the dilemmas of schooling conducted by Berlak and Berlak (1981). The Berlaks investigated the nature of teaching dilemmas in 19 English schools. Their framework of dilemmas and dilemma language was the inspiration for this study of mentoring dilemmas in the Bright Futures field experience and provided the initial structure upon which this study was constructed. The Berlaks' four categories of dilemmas depict groupings of the problematic situations that revolved around issues of control, curriculum, and social norms. Within each category were specific dilemmas that represented the tensions teachers felt about the various aspects of their work. The utility of the Berlaks' framework was that it provided a point of departure for this study and a way to begin organizing data.

According to Berlak and Berlak (1981), dilemmas are intangible obstacles that are common to some degree in all classrooms. Further, dilemmas are indicators of teachers' priorities that occur when they perceive or feel tension

stemming from a problematic situation and must choose between competing alternatives for resolution. For this study, the dilemmas of the four participants were documented through interviews and observations and explained in four individual case studies. Understanding how the participants identified and resolved their dilemmas provides insights about their priorities for mentoring sessions and the values they have assimilated from mainstream culture. Such insights are helpful for teacher educators who design and provide scaffolds of support for preservice teachers in early field experiences with diverse learners.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe preservice teachers' dilemmas in an early field experience. The following research questions were used to guide the investigation:

1. What dilemmas do white, female mentors identify as they work with African American children in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program?
2. How do mentors resolve dilemmas?

Qualitative research methods were used to answer these questions and were appropriate for this study for three reasons: (a) this was a study of a unique phenomenon in which participants constructed meaning based on their individual perspectives; (b) the guiding questions required gathering data from the field in order to describe the contexts of mentoring dilemmas; and (c) in order to answer the guiding questions, the research report had to reflect the participants' perspectives and how <u>they</u> experienced dilemmas (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Qualitative, or naturalistic, research is derived from a phenomenological perspective (Merriam, 1998). Central to phenomenology is the belief that humans interpret experiences in a multitude of ways as they interact with others (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982). Therefore, in a qualitative study, it is essential that the researcher focus on what situations and

experiences mean to the people being studied. In the chapters that follow, the reader will be given a glimpse inside the worlds of Bright Futures mentors. The case studies are based on the real life experiences of four mentors, and each case will expand the readers' understandings of a phenonomenon about which little is known.

In order to gain full and thorough understanding of the particular situations surrounding mentors' experiences with dilemmas, case studies were constructed for each of the participants. Case study research consists of data collection, analysis, and reporting on a single phenomenon, event, or instance. Case study methods are recommended when the researchers inquiry revolves around how or why questions about a contemporary phenomenon that is occurring in real life over which the researcher has no influence (Yin, 1984).

Understanding the nature of mentoring dilemmas requires an emic, or insider's, view (Merriam, 1998). Therefore, 7observations were conducted in order to document accurately participants' activities in the field. Interviews were conducted for the purpose of recording participants' understandings and interpretations of events surrounding dilemmas. Ethnographic methods of data collection were well-suited for this study in that the data consisted largely of participants' own words. Collection of such data was necessary for constructing cases that document participants' perceptions about how they identified and resolved dilemmas.

The case reports incorporate three types of qualitative data: observations, interviews, and written artifacts. It is common for researchers who conduct case study investigations

to utilize participant observation and interviews (Borg & Gall, 1989; Merriam, 1998); in this study, interviews and observations were the primary sources of data.

Combining case study and ethnography is reasonable provided the investigator does not confuse these terms and consider them synonymous (Yin, 1993). What distinguishes ethnography from case study is the scope of the inquiry; ethnography revolves around gaining understandings of a culture by studying it as a whole in context. Additionally, ethnographers tend to start their inquiry from scratch, that is, assuming almost nothing about the people and situations under study. Conversely, case study researchers' foci are much more narrow.

The assumption underlying the decision to conduct case study research is that the researcher has determined that there is a preexisting case of something that deserves attention. Ethnographers tend not to assume such things from the outset. Case study and ethnography have their origins in phenomenology. Phenomenological research has been described as working like a funnel (Bogdan & Biklin, 1989; Spradley, 1979); the researcher works inductively from virtually knowing nothing toward the core or essential elements of a social phenomenon. Using the funnel analogy, ethnographers, then, work from the outermost and widest point of the rim of the funnel. Case study researchers, however, start much closer to the narrow neck of the funnel. Because this study was based upon extensive research on Bright Futures, and quite a bit is known about certain aspects of Bright Futures mentoring, the focus of this investigation was on one aspect

of the mentoring experience: mentors' identification and resolutions of the dilemmas they encountered working with African American children.

Spradley's (1979) Ethnographic Research Cycle (E.R.C.) was used as a guide for data collection and analysis. The E.R.C. is a component of Spradley's (1979; 1980) Developmental Research Sequence (D.R.S.), which is a systematic process for qualitative research and is described in the section below on data collection. The E.R.C. consists of formulating guiding research questions, gathering data, organizing data, and analyzing data. Spradley (1980) contends that following this sequence only once is insufficient for gaining insights into unfamiliar social situations. In Spradley's (1980) view, the data analysis step often results in the researcher finding gaps in her or his knowledge. This makes it necessary to return to the field, conduct more observations and interviews, construct updated ethnographic records, and analyze the new data. Engaging this cycle repeatedly helps the researcher gain a clearer sense of what she or he has discovered through data analyses. According to Spradley (1980), the E.R.C. yields substantial quantities of rich, accurate, and poignant data.

Ethnographic methods provided the data needed to portray accurately what Yin (1984) refers to as the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events (p. 14). The four cases about mentors' encounters with dilemmas provide insights needed by teacher educators who provide support for preservice teachers in similar field experiences.

Participants

The participants in this study were junior-year students at the University of Florida who are enrolled in the elementary education program. As is the case with most teacher preparation programs in the United States, nearly all of the preservice teachers enrolled in Elementary Proteach are white, middle class females who have had little experience with people who are culturally different from themselves (Bondy & Davis, 1996a).

All four of the participants in this study fit the descriptions above, that is, they were white, under 25 years of age, middle class, females in the Elementary Proteach program. The participants in the present study were between 18 and 23 years of age. Though not all preservice teachers in Elementary Proteach are white, middle class, and female, participants were drawn from this majority population for four reasons: (a) Nationwide demographics for the United States show that white, middle class females represent the largest contingency of preservice teachers (Grant & Secada, 1990); (b) The majority of mentors in Bright Futures are white, middle class females (Bondy & Davis, 1996a); (c) White preservice teachers are not being well prepared to teach children of color (Haberman, 1996); and (d) Teacher educators need to know more about how white, middle class females experience fieldwork in order to provide the support needed to maximize the learning opportunities such experiences provide (McIntyre et al., 1996).

Selection of Participants

Participants were chosen from sections of the Research and Reading I courses not taught by the investigator. The total enrollment of first semester Elementary Proteach students was 140. Of the 140 students, approximately 50 were enrolled in sections of the research course and reading laboratory taught by the investigator. The population from which participants were drawn was 90 preservice teachers.

Five additional factors decreased the overall population from which participants were selected. To fit the investigation within the body of literature on preparing typical preservice teachers for diversity, two demographic factors had to be satisfied: The participants had to be white and female. Potential candidates also had to return signed informed consent forms stating that they were willing to participate in the study. More than 70 of the participants fit these two criteria; however, only 25 preservice teachers returned informed consent forms. After eliminating potential participants who were enrolled for courses taught by the investigator, 11 candidates remained.

The final selection, which resulted in a pool of six candidates, was based on the candidates' assignments to learning centers. In the interest of gaining access to learning centers, the investigator chose two Centers in which to conduct observations. These learning centers were staffed by supervising teachers (and one site manager) with whom the investigator had worked before and the buildings were well-suited to observation in that observations could be conducted with minimal disruption to mentoring sessions. One candidate

was eliminated because she did not fit the demographic criteria (she was African American) and another was eliminated because she was more than 25 years old. The four remaining candidates became the participants in this study.

Participants' Teacher Education Course Work

The participants were first semester Elementary Proteach students in their junior year at the university. During the first semester, preservice teachers are enrolled full time in courses within the College of Education. All Elementary education majors take the Research in Elementary Education course, EDE 3481, Exploring Diversity, EDE 3801, Classroom Reading I, RED 3312, Introduction to Educational Media, EDG 4930, Introduction to Instructional Computing, EME 3402, and they participate in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. Descriptions of each of the courses and of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program are presented below. The descriptions were derived from syllabi for each course.

Research in elementary education

In the Research course, students work through a syllabus that includes the topics: (a) Reflective teaching (Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993); (b) Differing views on what is good teaching; (c) What good teaching means for today's culturally diverse classrooms; and (d) What good teaching means in terms of a culturally diverse society. When this investigation was conducted, the Research course reflected the ongoing research efforts of the faculty members who had published several papers describing its evolution (Ross & Bondy, 1993, 1996a).

In the Research course, students read professional literature, viewed videos, and participated in a variety of

activities to promote examination of course concepts. Two papers are required in which students relate their views on diversity issues and also their educational commitments as prospective teachers. The papers and the course are designed to help students reflect on educational issues related to equity and justice for all learners.

Exploring diversity

The Exploring Diversity course was an introduction to the Elementary Proteach Program and the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. The purpose of the course was to help preservice teachers explore the concepts of culture and diversity and the meaning they have in their lives and in their work with children and families (Course Syllabus, Fall Semester, 1997). To this end, students enrolled in this course read two texts that address diversity issues and keep a personal response journal. Weekly class sessions include activities, presentations, and guest speakers, all of which are intended to help preservice teachers broaden their perspectives about culture.

The course was designed to complement the Research course and the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. In addition to learning the meaning and significance of culture, preservice teachers learn to view events from multiple perspectives and withhold judgment of people, to illuminate their own assumptions and stereotypes, and to develop supportive relationships with people who are different from themselves. These objectives provide scaffolding for all of the students enrolled in the course as they participate in the field experience in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

Classroom reading I

The classroom reading I course was an introduction to the teaching of reading in the elementary school. Syllabus topics include the prerequisites of reading, principles of reading instruction, basic diagnosis of reading problems, basic approaches to reading instruction, types of reading programs used in elementary classrooms, academic and literacy programs in elementary schools, how to work with diverse and exceptional readers, and basics of classroom management for reading teachers. The Reading course included several exercises that support Bright Futures mentors, especially lesson planning. Students attended weekly lectures and follow-up laboratory sessions. In lab sessions, issues from lectures were discussed and assistance was provided for course assignments. In the semester during which this study was conducted, the Reading course was restructured to complement the Research and Exploring Diversity courses.

Introduction to educational media

The educational media course introduced students to the basics of using educational media and the fundamentals of instructional design. Students learned to select and use various visual and audio media and media equipment effectively for instruction, specifically to enhance communication between the teacher and students. Additionally, students learned to operate educational media equipment found in public schools.

Introduction to instructional computing

The instructional computing course introduced students to current and emerging instructional technologies as well as

frameworks for critical assessment of the changing nature of humankind's relationship to information and knowledge (course syllabus, Fall, 1997). Students examined issues relating to the influence of technology on our society, especially education, and how technology has expanded our knowledge base. Simultaneously, students learned the basics of computer operation, multimedia, word processing, evaluation of educational software, and how to use the Internet and E-mail in the public schools.

Bright Futures mentoring program

All first semester preservice teachers in the Elementary Proteach Program at the University of Florida participated in the Bright Futures Mentoring (formerly tutoring) Program. This early field experience paired preservice teachers with African-American children who lived in local public housing neighborhoods. Bright Futures was a dual purpose field experience that helped low income African American children residing in public housing neighborhoods to be more successful in school and prepared prospective elementary school teachers to work well with students with whom they were unfamiliar (Bondy, 1994). Bright Futures has evolved from a tutoring program to a mentoring field experience aimed at developing helping relationships between first semester preservice teachers (mentors) and public housing neighborhood children.

Bright Futures took place over ten weeks of a sixteen-week semester. Mentors were assigned to work with children who lived in one of five public housing neighborhoods in which mentoring occurred. Mentoring sessions occurred

biweekly for one-hour sessions that took place in a neighborhood community center. Mentors were responsible for planning and implementing activities for sessions and received feedback from experienced public school teachers assigned to each learning center.

Data Collection

The purpose of this study was to understand how Bright Futures mentors identified and resolved dilemmas by constructing case studies based on data collected using ethnographic methods. Three kinds of data were collected: participants' responses to interview questions, observation field notes, and samples of written artifacts produced by participants. Principles for data collection described by Yin (1984) and Spradley's (1980) Developmental Research Sequence (D.R.S.) were used to guide this study.

The choice to gather three sources of data was consistent with Yin's (1984) first principle of data collection: Using multiple sources of evidence (p. 89). According to Yin (1984), using multiple sources of data--called triangulating--helps increase the validity and reliability of the researcher's cases. Triangulating data ensured the accuracy of the investigator's analyses, which were based predominantly on evidence rather than impressions.

Yin (1984) also emphasizes the need for rigorous quality control (p. 97) when collecting data for the construction of case studies. Quality control refers to the need for the researcher to attend to logistical details, such as keeping careful notes as the study progresses and records as to the times, dates, locations, and names of informants throughout

the project. Additionally, Yin (1984) recommends that case study researchers construct a "chain of evidence" (p.96) that can be traced from the case report to the actual data from which the case is constructed and also to the researcher's initial research questions.

Following Yin's (1984) and Spradley's (1979; 1980) recommendations, large quantities of data were collected from interviews, observations and written artifacts in order to understand how the participants identified and resolved dilemmas. Spradley's (1980) D.R.S. was adapted as a guide for data collection as observations and interviews were conducted; the D.R.S. was also used for analyses of written artifacts. The investigator made 102 pages of field notes during observations of all four participants. Interviews were transcribed and yielded 290 pages of typed, double-spaced data.

Spradley (1980) asserts that the D.R.S. methodology is ideal when the researcher desires to illuminate the meanings that people attach to things. Conducting research based on a linear model wherein data are collected and analyzed only once is not likely to help the investigator gain meaningful insights. According to Spradley (1979, 1980), this is because gathering data only once is likely to result in an extremely limited view of the social situation being studied. Therefore, data collection and analysis must occur in a cyclic rather than linear pattern.

Spradley's (1980) Ethnographic Research Cycle (E.R.C.) includes asking questions, collecting data, recording data, and analyzing data; these steps are repeated. Questions were

used to guide field observations and interviews. Although the investigator had research questions prepared in advance for observations and interviews, allowances were made for questions to emerge from the process of observing and interviewing. Such questions were used to guide subsequent interviews, field observations, and data analysis. Rather than being the end result of an investigation, data analysis for this study was an ongoing part of the research cycle. The cycle of asking questions, collecting data, recording data, analyzing data, and then asking more questions continued until the investigator had a clear understanding of how the participants identified and resolved dilemmas.

Participant Interviewing

All interviews for this study were ethnographic interviews; that is, they were constructed strategically so that participants felt compelled to "talk about what they know" (Spradley, 1979, p. 9). Through ethnographic interviewing, it was possible to document the tacit and explicit meanings that participants attached to their work with their mentees.

Formal interviews were scheduled to follow field observations. Interview protocols appear in Appendix A. Six formal interviews were completed with each participant for a total of 24 regularly scheduled formal interviews. Two additional interviews were completed for three of the participants. These interviews provided additional data for clarifying the investigator's analyses and data to fill domains.

Formal interviews began as soon as the participants were selected and were held every other week during the Bright Futures field experience. All interviews included only the investigator and one participant. Interviews were conducted in a conversational and relaxed manner so that participants felt comfortable providing information. Formal interviews were scheduled at the participants' convenience and conducted in a private office. Interview sessions were from 45 to 120 minutes in length.

Informal interviews occurred infrequently during this investigation. Two informal interviews were conducted after field observations at the learning centers; however, the participants typically were not interested in being interviewed at that time. Several informal interviews occurred before and after formal interviews as the investigator worked to maintain a personal relationship with the participants. Topics of discussion in informal interviews tended to revolve around the progress of the study and how the participants were getting along with their mentees. Notes were not taken during informal interviews; rather, the investigator made notes of relevant information from informal interviews after the formal interview was completed and the participant had departed.

During formal interviews, audio tapes were made of the sessions and notes taken while participants responded to questions prepared by the investigator in advance. Either the entire audio tapes from interviews were transcribed after formal interviews, or if time did not permit, segments of the tapes were transcribed for the purpose of constructing

interview questions for subsequent interviews. In all, 31 hours of interview sessions were recorded and transcribed for this study.

Notes taken during all interviews focused on recording verbal and nonverbal data. Selected words or phrases germane to the guiding questions for the study were recorded in notes. Often these words or phrases prompted spontaneous questions, which the investigator wrote down and asked at an opportune moment. Asking such questions was consistent with Spradley's (1979) recommendation that interview questions be seen as "tools, each to be adapted to particular informants" (p. 125). Notes were also taken about the tone of voice used by the participants as well as non-verbal data, such as facial expressions, posture, and other body language.

There was a direct relationship between field observations and formal interviews in this study. Interviews focused on having participants describe what was happening in Bright Futures and the dilemmas they encountered working with their mentees. A set of core questions (see Appendix) was prepared for interviews; however, spontaneous questions were asked as unexpected or particularly intriguing topics arose. Data from observation fieldnotes and from transcripts of interviews served as guides as questions were constructed to be used in subsequent interviews and were occasionally unique for each participant. Some spontaneous questions were useful for all four participants, especially as it became clear what kinds of problems the participants considered to be dilemmas. Observation data provided prompts for discussion in formal interviews that followed observations. In these interviews,

questions were asked about situations observed that the participants did not mention of their own accord. Observation data were particularly useful when asking participants to verify examples of kinds of dilemmas and also for comparison and contrast questions as they described their mentoring sessions.

Ethnographic interviewing is intentionally flexible and responsive, since the goal is to be able to retell the stories of participants using their own words as much as possible (Spradley, 1979). Several core questions were asked repeatedly of the participants, such as: (a) How are things going with your mentee?; (b) What did you do with your mentee during your latest visit?; and (c) Tell me how things are going in mentoring. The core question that was asked most often was "Have you encountered any dilemmas in mentoring?" As participants related information that answered core questions, opportunities arose to ask spontaneous questions. Many of the departures from interview protocol were for the purpose of asking for more details and examples. Though numerous spontaneous questions were asked, particular care was taken not to make participants feel as though they were being interrogated or evaluated.

Allowing participants to talk freely when their comments took the conversation in a desirable direction assured that interviews were "balanced between being focused and having an open-ended nature" (Yin 1984 p. 83). When the participants' comments grew extraneous, the investigator redirected them to either the previous question or the next item on the list of predetermined questions. Also, adherence to the list and

phrasing of interview questions varied due to individual differences between participants, especially differences in the frequency with which they encountered dilemmas and their approaches to dilemma resolution.

As themes emerged from participants' descriptions of dilemmas, follow-up questions were constructed to shape the direction of subsequent interviews. This occurred on an individual basis for each participant. Examples of follow-up inquiries or questions were: (a) Tell me about the problem you are having helping your mentee with reading; (b) What are your concerns about this behavior problem?; and (c) What have you tried in order to resolve the problem of your mentee's inattention? The intent of follow-up questions was to build and extend upon the information given by participants about their particular approaches to dilemma identification and resolution. As transcripts of such interviews were analyzed, new dilemmas were noted, added to existing domains or domain categories, or added as a new domains or categories as necessary.

Ethnographic interviewing is most effective when accomplished in stages that complement the stages of observation. Therefore, the same pattern from Spradley's (1979, 1980) Developmental Research Sequence was used for interviews as for observations. That is, the most broad questions were asked first and focus was made more narrow for the subsequent interviews. Each type of interview question used in the formal interviewing process is described in detail below. Spradley (1980) describes this process as resembling a funnel. The first level of interviewing focuses

on broad descriptive questions, which are like the broad rim of the funnel. As the funnel narrows, so does the focus of the researcher's interview questions. Structural questions, the second level of interviewing in the D.R.S., provide adequate information for a smooth transition to the most narrow scope of the investigation, contrast questions. As in ethnographic participant observation, the pattern of ethnographic interviewing in the D.R.S. is cyclical. That is, interviewing begins with descriptive questions, proceeds to structural and contrast questions, then returns to broad questions as the researcher gains new insights. The researcher repeats the cycle until enough data have been collected to answer the questions guiding the study.

Descriptive questions

The first interviews included broad descriptive questions. Broad descriptive questions, like broad descriptive observations, provide a general survey of the events, activities, use of time and space, and descriptions of the people in a social situation. Questions were asked that encouraged participants to "ramble on and on" (Spradley, 1979, p. 87) about their mentoring sessions. The information that participants provided helped the investigator recognize prominent features of the field experience from their perspectives. The focus of descriptive questions included: (a) components of their mentoring sessions; (b) the kinds of things the participants were learning about their abilities to teach their mentees; and (c) the participants' encounters with dilemmas during sessions; (d) the participants' emotional states during sessions.

Structural questions

The focus of questions for the second round of interviews was more narrow. As domains filled with information about the overall context of mentoring sessions, structural questions were posed. Structural questions seek the participants' detailed explanations about items of interest and help the researcher construct lists of related phrases and terms. For example, the participants were asked to give step-by-step descriptions of how they went about resolving particular dilemmas. A goal for asking structural questions was the construction of exhaustive lists of phrases and terms that provided insights about patterns that emerged during data analysis. Structural questions were asked to establish limits to lists of related terms with participants' help. An example of a structural question was: "What was the first thing that you did to get your mentee to pay attention?" The investigator followed up this question immediately with prompts for the participants to describe subsequent steps of their attempts at getting their mentees to pay attention. Broad, descriptive questions were used as Spradley (1979) recommends throughout the interviewing process to provide the impetus for asking structural questions. Alternating between broad, descriptive questions and structural questions helped keep interviews interesting for the participants, since asking several structural questions in a row could have seemed like an inquisition.

Contrast questions

The final round of interviews narrowed the focus of the investigation further by asking contrast questions. Contrast

questions were posed so that participants were prompted to describe how familiar terms were related in both explicit and implicit ways (Spradley, 1979). To understand how participants attached meaning to terms related to mentoring dilemmas, it was necessary to ask them how terms related to dilemmas were used, how they were limited or restricted, and also how important the terms were relative to others. An example of a contrast question was: "You have told me about the dilemmas you have encountered while working with your mentee on math word problems; are there similar dilemmas you have encountered when you were not working with your mentee on math? What are they?" Contrast questions were used for verification of the investigator's understandings constructed during data analysis and when participants provided new terms or used familiar terms in unique ways. Most importantly, Spradley's (1979) recommendation was heeded to use contrast questions in complement with broad, descriptive and structural questions.

Participant Observation

The investigator spent considerable time in the two designated learning centers as a participant observer making broad descriptive observations, focused observations, and selected observations (Spradley, 1980). Observation data were used in two ways: (a) to provide triangulation to verify the accuracy of data from interviews and written artifacts; and (b) to provide the investigator with first-hand information upon which to base interview questions about mentoring dilemmas. Two types of observations were often conducted within one observation session. When selecting

positions within the learning centers for conducting observations, the investigator chose locations that were unobtrusive to the participants and other mentors. Both learning centers had school desks that the investigator placed strategically in the rooms allowing visual contact with the participants while maintaining a distance that lessened the chances of observations and note taking becoming distractions. While observing, the investigator was careful to give the participants and their mentees the impression that the investigator was oblivious to them. The investigator did not approach or speak with any of the participants while they worked with their mentees. Discussions between participants and the investigator occurred after the mentees were dismissed.

Descriptive observations

Visits to the learning centers during the first two weeks of the study provided the opportunity to conduct broad, descriptive observations for the purpose of getting familiar with the routines of the mentoring pairs, the site managers, and the supervising teachers. Broad descriptive observations focused on answering general questions about what went on in the learning centers. Two intensive broad descriptive observations were conducted for each learning center in the first week of mentoring. These observations were conducted before the arrival of the participants and provided descriptions of the settings and social contexts in which the participants worked as mentors.

Focused observations

As stated in the opening section on data collection, data collection and analysis took place simultaneously; data analysis began at the outset of the investigation. As sufficient data were collected from the broad descriptive observations, focused observations occurred next. As recommended by Spradley (1979), focused observations involved asking and answering questions from the investigator about terms that had particular relevance and meaning to the participants or specific situations observed during mentoring sessions. For example, the participants were asked to describe how it felt when their mentees rejected an activity. Lists of terms and phrases were compiled and placed in domains of similar terms, such as "Sessions don't go as planned." The terms describing domains include the participants' own words combined with those of the investigator. Domain construction helped the researcher formulate questions to guide subsequent rounds of observations.

Four focused observations were conducted for each participant, for a total of 16 focused observations. These observations provided specific and detailed information about particular incidents that occurred during mentoring sessions. During focused observation, the investigator paid particular attention to situations that seemed problematic for the participants and the mentees. Such evidence of the participants' encounters with dilemmas was the source of questions for formal interviews. As themes emerged and were confirmed by observations and interviews, the focus of data

analysis turned to constructing domains of dilemmas and resolutions.

According to Spradley (1980), there are five criteria that can help narrow the focus of a study and the kinds of data that are collected:

1. Personal Interest--when the researcher has determined which domains or clusters of domains are the most interesting.
2. Suggestions by informants--when the researcher has decided which domains the informants of the study believe are most important.
3. Theoretical Interest--when the researcher has decided which domains are connected to relevant social theories.
4. Strategic Ethnography--when the researcher has decided which domains are the most useful for collecting data that will serve in the public interest.
5. Organizing Domains--when the researcher has determined which domain or domains seem to tie a number of domains together (p. 105).

Focused observations helped narrow the investigation to filling domains that were related to dilemmas and dilemma resolution.

As the participants talked freely about what they did in mentoring sessions, they described a multitude of problems; some were dilemmas and others were not. Many of the dilemmas documented for this study were not explicitly identified as such by the participants. Even when they were not prompted

by the investigator to talk about dilemmas, many of the problems described by the participants fit the definition of dilemma used for the study. The method used for sorting out dilemmas from other types of problems was to examine the participants' descriptions and determine whether they mentioned either thinking about or attempting a resolution. In other words, as data analysis became more focused, the investigator found that isolating dilemmas in the words of the participants often required finding evidence of their having mentioned resolutions; once a reference to a resolution was discovered, the dilemma was more readily identifiable.

Spradley's (1980) D.R.S. accounts for the needs of the researcher to understand a few domains in great depth and detail and for viewing a social situation holistically. Descriptive observations, which are the first level of data collection in the D.R.S., provided holistic information about the contextual factors surrounding the social situation in which this investigation took place. Focused observations, the second level of data collection in the D.R.S., provided detailed, in-depth investigations of particular lists of concepts, terms, or phrases of interest. The insights that helped answer the guiding questions for the study resulted from the most in-depth type of observations and the third level of data collection recommended by Spradley (1980) in the D.R.S., selected observations.

Selected observations

Selected observations are investigations derived from the researcher's questions about particular kinds of domains

that help narrow the focus of the study. For this study, four selected observations were conducted per participant, for a total of 16 selected observations. As progress was made through the D.R.S. and selected observations began, two levels of data analysis were completed. Selected observations aided the process of verifying the investigator's understandings of how to sort data within domains and construction of interview questions that would provide data to fill domains. Selected observations also provided checks on the accuracy of the investigator's interpretations of the data.

Written Artifacts

Samples of participants' written work over the Fall, 1997 semester were collected. Written artifacts consisted of papers and assignments completed by participants in course work and for the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. Written artifacts were sources of unobtrusive data (Borg & Gall, 1989), or data that are not subject to the researcher's influence. Such data were used to verify understandings gleaned from observations, interviews, and analyses of data from these activities. Written artifacts strengthened the investigator's understandings of how the participants identified and resolved dilemmas and also served as sources for observation and interview questions. All artifacts were acquired with the full consent and knowledge of participants, the instructors for the research course, the exploring diversity course, as well as the director of Bright Futures.

Students enrolled in the research course and the exploring diversity course were required to write about their

past and current beliefs and actions related to working with children and their responses to readings and experiences they had in their first semester in Elementary Proteach. The participants were asked to provide copies of the beliefs paper and the diversity assignment for the research course. The beliefs paper required students to examine their aims and beliefs about education, teaching, and learning from their entering and current perspectives. The diversity assignment was a research project that required students to construct an outline focusing on practices related to teaching diverse learners, and to find relevant resources in teaching literature that provide strategies for implementation in elementary classrooms.

As the exploring diversity course served as the forum for organizing and implementing Bright Futures mentoring, journals from this course seemed likely to provide important data. Therefore, participants were asked to provide copies of journal entries kept for the course. In the journal, students responded to issues from course presentations, to course readings, and to mentoring experiences. These artifacts were collected in order to examine them for evidence to confirm the investigator's observations and understandings about what participants did during their mentoring sessions. Journal entries also were examined for indications of participants' efforts to address and resolve the dilemmas they encountered as well as to help the investigator construct subsequent interview questions.

Participants completed weekly activity plans as part of the requirements for the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

All mentors completed and submitted one set of plans consisting of several activities to be implemented in the two one-hour sessions. For each activity, mentors briefly described their purpose and the steps they intended to follow. A total of 10 activity plans were completed by each participant for the semester. The investigator requested copies of these plans for the purpose of triangulating data gathered from observations, interviews, and other written artifacts; activity plans served as evidence to corroborate data from other sources and provided another source of questions for subsequent interviews. Interview questions were constructed based on lesson plans; for example, "I see that you took action on the reading dilemma you told me about last time. Why did you choose this course of action?" Such discussion provided an opportunity to record participants' explanations for their thoughts and actions.

All written artifacts were utilized for confirmation of the investigator's interpretations of observational and interview data. To this end, Yin's (1984) principle of creating a case study data base was applied. Data from written artifacts were collected and used as the investigator worked to confirm or refute hypotheses. During interviews, participants were asked to explain how they arrived at the conclusions indicated in written artifacts.

Written artifacts such as required papers, mentoring activity plans, and journals from the reading and exploring diversity courses were important in this study because they contained examples of the participants' views and the terms they used to describe dilemmas. Such written artifacts were

useful sources of corroborating evidence during data collection and data analysis. The beliefs paper from the research course yielded insights about participants' values regarding educational issues, while journals from the exploring diversity course provided samples of the students' explanations for their beliefs about teaching diverse learners. Such insights were helpful for maintaining the integrity and accuracy of data analyses, the case study reports, and the interpretation of findings.

Data Analysis

This study documents how four mentors identify and resolve dilemmas. The main sources of data were ethnographic interviews and fieldnotes from observations. Written artifacts were used for triangulation of observation and interview data, confirmation of data analyses, and for constructing observation and interview questions. Spradley's (1980) Developmental Research Cycle was used to guide the data analysis process. Data analysis began when the first round of observations and interviews was completed. This process helped in the construction of effective interview questions that focused participants' attention on dilemmas they encountered. Two kinds of data analysis was employed for this study: domain analysis and taxonomic analysis.

Domain analysis began following the first round of interviews. According to Spradley (1979), "any symbolic category that includes other categories is a domain" (p. 100). The researcher should strive to construct domains that "preserve the participants' unique styles and language patterns. All terms in a domain must share at least one

feature of meaning" (Spradley, 1979, p. 100). Domain construction served three purposes for this study: (a) domains documented participants' own words that described a particular phenomenon, (b) domains helped the investigator interpret patterns in the dilemma language of the participants, and (c) patterns in domains that indicated the existence of a dilemma were used to construct questions for subsequent interviews. Domains of terms related to categories of dilemmas and dilemma resolutions were formed throughout the process of data analysis. As domains began to fill with participants' terms, patterns emerged that were helpful for understanding how the participants constructed their language of dilemmas and how they resolved dilemmas. As the number of domains grew, taxonomies were constructed that helped explain how the participants thought about and resolved dilemmas.

Taxonomic analysis involves searching for patterns as they appear within and between domains (Spradley, 1979). As soon as it was possible to construct a number of domains that referred to dilemma identification and resolution, data were examined for explicit and implicit relationships among domain entries. As observations, interviews, transcription of interview tapes, and domain analysis continued, it was possible to construct follow-up questions for the purpose of clarifying patterns in participants' words. As patterns become more clear, hierarchies emerged that suggested how domains were related (Spradley, 1979). These hierarchies were constructed inductively, an essential process of case study investigation (Merriam, 1988). In this study, concepts

and generalizations were derived from the data rather than from predetermined notions.

Definition of "Dilemma" Constructed for the Study

Based on the participants' responses to questions about the definition and nature of dilemmas, the investigator synthesized a definition of dilemma that reflected the participants' perspectives. In their first or second interview, participants were asked to give a meaning for the term "dilemma" and provide an example. Though the investigator emphasized the term dilemma during interviews, it was not an assumption of this study that the term meant the same things to the participants as it did to the investigator. Therefore, the investigator examined all direct and indirect references to the term dilemma in transcripts and combined all elements of participants' definitions that were common to the four participants. The constructed definition is: The kind of problems or problematic situations characterized by a pull or feeling of tension caused by cognitive dissonance combined with a change in emotional status. The constructed definition contrasts with the Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed.)(1997) definition, which is "a problem involving a difficult choice" or "a difficult or persistent problem" (p. 325). The constructed definition is much more specific; it adds the dimensions of cognitive dissonance and a change in emotional state as causes of dilemmas. The constructed definition also adds the feeling of being pulled in at least two directions as an effect of experiencing dilemmas.

The definition of dilemma used for this study evolved as the domain of dilemmas filled, and the examples of dilemmas were examined for common aspects. The definition was used for identifying data that were not related to dilemmas and for the construction of structural and contrast questions for interviews. The participants reported consistently that dilemmas were problems that made them feel compelled toward a resolution and were accompanied by some degree of stress. The emotional component distinguished dilemmas from mundane problems; for the participants, dilemmas elicited feelings of uncertainty, anxiety, confusion, exasperation, or aggravation. The cognitive dissonance component refers to the participants' being stirred to active thinking because of their perceptions of the situation having negative consequences if left unresolved; the equilibrium of their situation had been upset, so the participants felt a need to regain stability. The definition enabled the investigator to locate dilemmas in transcripts of conversations that did not follow a direct question about dilemmas. Moreover, it aided the investigator in maintaining a focus on what the participants considered dilemmas, rather than imposing a definition.

Validity and Reliability

Two major criteria often are used for judging the quality of research designs: validity and reliability. These criteria are of utmost importance for case study research. When data are collected in valid and reliable ways, the case report is more likely to achieve the researcher's desired purposes to "explore, describe and

explain a social situation" (Yin, 1984 p.15). Validity and reliability are not concerned with data collection alone; Yin (1984) states that "tests of reliability and validity should be applied throughout the subsequent conduct of the case study" (p. 37).

Validity in qualitative research refers to the degree to which the finding is interpreted in a correct way (Kirk & Miller, 1986 p. 20). Validity is often a tertiary concern in qualitative studies because a qualitative study may be seen as having validity if the report is "an authentic representation of what is happening in a social situation" (Shimahara, 1990 p. 86). Several steps were taken to ensure the validity of the research report. Large quantities of data were collected, the investigator's interpretations were checked with participants, the investigator conducted repeated bias checks, and steps were taken by the investigator to establish himself as a fixture at the learning centers.

Problems with validity were dealt with in this study by acknowledging biases from the outset and revisiting personal biases throughout. One of the investigator's highest priorities was to become familiar with the people and the social environment in which the study took place. The case studies constructed for this study are intended to describe the particular experience of four mentors who participated in the study. This final report represents the data authentically and in its proper context.

Reliability in ethnographic research is the "repeatability of a given study by researchers other than the

original participant observer; the extent to which independent researchers discover the same phenomena in comparable situations" (Shimahara, 1990 p. 86). To strengthen the reliability of a study, the investigator constructed an audit trail (Richert, 1991) or chain of evidence (Yin, 1984). Throughout the data collection process, the investigator maintained quality control (Yin, 1984), which included keeping careful records of dates and times on all documents and making certain that no important pieces of evidence were lost. The intent of quality control was to make it possible to retrace the investigator's steps from final conclusions to initial details. According to Yin (1984), reliability increases as it becomes possible for the reader to trace the investigator's steps and reach similar conclusions.

Generalizability

Problems with generalizability abound in subjective research methods (Borg & Gall, 1989). Since bias accompanies any analysis of a population, qualitative researchers must be careful when making generalizations from their studies. Instead of making unfounded broad generalizations, case study investigators can provide evidence that the phenomena being described are typical (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). Kirk and Miller (1986) suggest that qualitative research need not be overly concerned about generalizability since it implies that there are general ways to describe multiple realities; often the world is too complex to describe with generalizations.

It is important to note that interpretations set forth in the cases may not be generalizable to other settings.

Some may view the lack of generalizability as a limitation; however, interpretations of what the participants say about their experiences may offer insights about similar early field experiences. Gaining such insights can increase the reader's understanding of the Bright Futures Mentoring experience. It is likely that preservice teachers in other programs that provide similar experiences with culturally unfamiliar children share some dilemmas in common with Bright Futures mentors.

Researcher Biases and Qualifications

The investigator is the main research instrument in qualitative study. As personal bias may affect the ways in which data are collected, analyzed, and interpreted, it is necessary to describe the background and qualifications of the investigator.

Personal biases may limit the study since the investigator held the position of instructor for at least one course that all first semester preservice teachers took concurrently with mentoring. The investigator's status as a doctoral student in the same department in which the preservice teachers took most of their course work also may have been a source of bias. If it is true that teachers beliefs influence their work (Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993; Webb & Sherman, 1989), then the investigator's beliefs and interests are likely to have found their way into interpretations of data.

The investigator spent three years teaching third and fifth grades in an elementary school in Florida. Prior to that, the investigator earned an M.Ed.in the area of

Elementary Education from the University of Florida. During the nearly six years from beginning work toward a masters degree and then teaching elementary school, the investigator spent many hours observing in classrooms. These classrooms were populated by high numbers of diverse learners; in both his student teaching internship and in the elementary school in which the investigator taught, there were higher than average numbers of culturally diverse children. This was because the internship schools and the school where the investigator taught were centers for English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs. Both schools also had Varying Exceptionalities (VE) programs, and exceptional student education (ESE) children were integrated into all classrooms. As a result of the investigator's bias toward working with diverse learners, he chose to specialize in working with diverse learners beginning in his preservice program. In keeping with the investigator's plans, he took a teaching position in a school that was very similar to his internship school; it was an ESOL school with a VE program in-house.

All course work for the investigator's Ph.D. in instruction and curriculum has been completed. Areas of study included inclusive curriculum, special education, and philosophy of education. The investigator completed two courses that emphasized qualitative research designs and methods, one that focused intensely on ethnographic studies. As part of this course, the investigator completed an ethnographic study of Bright Futures mentors (considered tutors at that time) and their perceptions of the support

afforded them. As a result, it is the belief of the investigator that he is biased toward using qualitative methods for conducting studies of diversity. The investigator also believes, and hence has a bias, that naturalistic investigations are best when the questions driving the study revolve around constructed knowledge.

As a doctoral student at the University of Florida, the investigator worked for eight semesters as a supervising teacher for The Bright Futures Mentoring (formerly tutoring) Program. This position required that he spend a minimum of ten hours per week at a learning center. Duties of this position included observing mentors and their children at work, evaluating activity plans, giving written and oral feedback to mentors, communicating with neighborhood residents, and acting as a conduit to the university coordinator for the project. A conservative estimate of the time spent by the investigator working on site for the Bright Futures Program is 850 hours. As part of his role as a graduate assistant to the director of Bright Futures, the investigator worked as a research assistant and coauthor for three qualitative studies that have been presented at two national conferences. One study recently has been completed and accepted for publication in a teacher education journal. As a result of his extended service in Bright Futures and the opportunities he has been afforded therein, it is the investigator's belief that he is biased as to the value of the Bright Futures experience; the investigator believes that participating in Bright Futures is one of the most powerful influences on preservice teachers in Elementary Proteach.

The investigator also believes that serving as a graduate assistant in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program is of immense value to a prospective teacher educator; there is little he has seen, heard of, or read about in professional literature that can compare with Bright Futures in terms of preparing teachers to work with diverse learners.

The investigator spent three semesters as a field advisor for part time Elementary Proteach preinterns and one semester as a field supervisor for full-time interns in Elementary Proteach. The investigator's duties for these positions included observing classroom teaching, collecting and examining lesson plans and other artifacts, and conferencing with student teachers individually and in groups. Common to all of these activities was the requirement of giving feedback and constructive criticism to preservice teachers on their plans and practice. As a result of these experiences, the investigator holds a bias toward including extensive and long-term field experiences for preservice teachers; especially in placements that provide preservice teachers with opportunities to work with diverse learners.

When viewed together, it is the belief of the investigator that his experiences provided ample qualifications for him to conduct this study of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. This type of research, in my view, is exactly what effective teacher educators do every day to ensure that they are helping preservice teachers to develop their abilities. It also is the belief of the investigator that this study was a natural extension of his

work as a teacher educator. It was a logical investigation to conduct as the investigator was able to use what he learned from it as he taught students who shared many characteristics with the participants.

Ethical Issues

The choice to use qualitative and, in particular, case study methods of data collection and analysis was made with ethics in mind. People have rights to privacy and should be free from harm. Therefore, precautions were taken to protect the rights of the participants. As Spradley (1980) suggests, the investigator acted on the behalf of participants to "protect their rights, interests and sensitivities since the research could have consequences unseen by participants" (Spradley, 1980 p. 21). Every precaution was taken to assure participants that they would not be exploited by this research. Participants' identities were protected by using pseudonyms in all written reports. Additionally, use of tape recording devices was cleared with participants before any taping commenced with the understanding that refusal was their prerogative. The investigator took full responsibility for all aspects of this research study, and would have abandoned it rather than violate any of these claims.

Overview of the Case Studies

Chapters 4 and 5 include case studies of the four preservice teachers who participated in this study. Chapter 4 includes the cases of participants 'Annie' and 'Betsy'. Chapter 5 includes the cases of participants 'Cindy' and 'Dawn'. Each chapter includes an overview of two participants' dilemmas, how they resolved dilemmas, and the

roles they played in mentoring. Biographical information about each participant is presented and descriptions of their mentoring sessions are provided. Detailed descriptions are given of the set of dilemmas experienced by the participants, as well as of the unique ways in which they resolved dilemmas. The chapters conclude with a discussion of similarities and differences between the two participants.

CHAPTER 4
ANNIE AND BETSY

The purpose of this study was to describe how mentors experience dilemmas working in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program with African American children and youth. Specifically, this study illustrates how four mentors identified and resolved dilemmas in their early field experience. The following questions drove the study:

1. What dilemmas do white, female mentors identify as they work with African American children in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program?
2. How do mentors resolve dilemmas?

To complete Annie's and Betsy's cases, the investigator analyzed data gathered from ethnographic interviews, observations, and written artifacts produced by the participants. Annie was interviewed and observed six times (she missed three mentoring sessions during the field experience). Betsy was interviewed eight times and observed nine times. The following case studies reflect Annie's and Betsy's unique stories of how they experienced dilemmas in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

Organization of the Chapter

This chapter includes case studies of Annie and Betsy, the two participants who demonstrated commitment to mentoring. That is, these participants dedicated time and energy to helping their mentee's learn throughout the field

experience. Each case contains a biographical description that includes information about Annie's and Betsy's families and home lives, schooling backgrounds, relevant experiences working with children, and their entering perspectives about the Bright Futures field experience. The biographies provide a vantage point from which to understand how Annie and Betsy identified and resolved mentoring dilemmas. The remainder of the cases includes an overview of Annie's and Betsy's mentoring sessions, descriptions of their dilemmas, and patterns of resolution for dilemmas (Berlak & Berlak, 1981).

During the 10 weeks of the Bright Futures field experience, all four participants mentioned 21 distinct dilemmas that fell into four domains. Annie's and Betsy's cases were constructed based on the most pervasive dilemmas they experienced out of the four common categories of dilemmas. For the largest dilemma category, knowing how to teach, examples from the data are presented for each of the subcategories in which Annie and Betsy mentioned dilemmas. For the remaining three dilemma categories, examples of dilemmas were chosen that represent not only vivid examples of how Annie and Betsy viewed particular dilemmas, but also include information that provides evidence to support the investigator's interpretations of each participant's orientation to mentoring.

The unique story of how Annie and Betsy experienced mentoring dilemmas becomes apparent as the frequencies of their encounters with dilemmas are combined with their patterns of resolution. These patterns of resolution provide insights about the participant's aims for mentoring, which for Annie and Betsy meant consistently dedicating time to

helping their mentees become more successful in school. Annie's and Betsy's patterns of resolution are directly related to their aims and the roles they assume. Therefore, the sections on dilemma resolution reflect their aims and roles.

Overview of Kinds of Dilemmas

Altogether, the four participants in this study mentioned dilemmas 247 times, either directly or indirectly (see Table 4-1). Annie and Betsy mentioned dilemmas 111 times, representing 45 percent of the dilemmas mentioned by participants in this study. The dilemmas were classified into four domain categories: knowing how to teach (knowing what to do to accomplish their goals), knowing myself (knowing about their own internal problems, personal issues, and self-awareness), knowing the mentee (knowing about the personal characteristics, temperament, interests, personal history, schooling background, and experiences of the child), and knowing the people in the neighborhood (knowing who lived in the community, who had contact with their mentees, what their understanding of Bright Futures were, what their views of visitors to the community were, and about their roles in the communities). Within each category are subcategories of specific mentoring dilemmas (see Tables 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5).

The category of knowing how to teach contains three main subcategories of domains that were common to all participants. These three subcategories are knowing how to teach subject matter, knowing how to generate and maintain interest, and knowing how to establish and maintain an emotional connection. The participants mentioned dilemmas of

knowing how to teach 173 times, which accounts for 70 percent of the dilemmas mentioned by participants in this study (see Table 4-1). Annie mentioned dilemmas in this category 44 times and Betsy mentioned these dilemmas 47 times.

Table 4-1
Counts of Domains and Dilemmas in Categories

Dilemma Category	Domains	Number of Dilemmas
1. Knowing how to teach	13	173 (70%)
2. Knowing myself	3	38 (15%)
3. Knowing about the mentee	4	28 (11%)
4. Knowing about the people in the neighborhood	2	8 (3%)
Totals	22	247

The category of knowing myself includes three dilemmas related to the participants' inability to manage emotional situations and personal knowledge deficits, as well as inability to articulate her thinking and learning processes. The dilemmas in this category are being prepared to deal with my emotions, knowing about my own lack of knowledge, and knowing about my own thinking and learning. The total number of dilemmas in this category was 38 (see Table 4-3), or 15 percent of the total number of dilemmas found in this investigation (see Table 4-1). Annie mentioned dilemmas in this category six times, while there were no instances wherein Betsy mentioned this type of dilemma whatsoever.

Table 4-2
Dilemmas ofKnowing How to Teach

Knowing how to teach subject matter	Annie (P1)	Betsy (P2)	Cindy (P3)	Dawn (P4)
Knowing how or when to help the mentee with basic skills	14	5	8	0
Plans backfire	2	5	2	3
Sessions or activities do not go as planned	4	3	1	6
Knowing how to infuse academics	3	0	4	0
Knowing how to assess the mentee's competence	2	6	3	4
Knowing how to manage time	0	0	1	2
				Total 78
Knowing how to generate and maintain interest				
Getting or maintaining the mentee'sattention	12	17	10	0
Getting the mentee to participate willingly	2	4	10	5
				Total 60

Table 4-2 continued

Knowing how to establish and maintain emotional connection				
Getting the mentee to talk	3	1	4	3
Knowing how to get familiar with the mentee	2	1	3	3
Knowing how to help the mentee with personal problems	0	5	1	0
			Total	26
Dealing with unsatisfactory conditions or support	0	0	0	3
			Total	3
Knowing how to communicate effectively	0	0	6	0
			Total	6
Grand Total				173

Table 4-3
Dilemmas of Knowing Myself

	Annie (P1)	Betsy (P2)	Cindy (P3)	Dawn (P4)
Being prepared to deal with my emotions	2	0	20	10
Knowing about my own lack of knowledge	1	0	0	2
Knowing about my own thinking and learning	3	0	0	0
Totals	6	0	20	12

Table 4-4
Dilemmas of Knowing the Mentee

	P1	P2	P3	P4
Mentee lacks knowledge, skill, ability, or aptitude	11	0	4	1
Mentee demonstrates learned helplessness	0	0	4	0
Mentee demonstrates resistance	0	1	4	0
Mentee demonstrates avoidance behavior	0	0	3	0
Totals	11	1	15	1

Table 4-5
Dilemmas of Knowing the People in the Neighborhood

	P1	P2	P3	P4
Knowing the mentee's family	1	1	1	1
Knowing the residents	0	0	4	0
Totals	1	1	5	1

The category of knowing the mentee includes four dilemmas related to what the participants believed were deficits in their mentees' abilities to learn from, think about, and perform academic tasks. This domain also contained the participants' referrences to dilemmas caused by their mentees' negative behaviors. The dilemmas in this category are mentee lacks knowledge, skills, abilities, or aptitude; mentee demonstrates learned helplessness; mentee demonstrates resistance; and mentee demonstrates avoidance behavior. The

total number of dilemmas in this category is 28 (see Table 4-4), or 11 percent of the total number of dilemmas found in this investigation (see Table 4-1). Annie mentioned dilemmas in this category 11 times and Betsy mentioned this kind of dilemma once.

The domain category of knowing the people in the neighborhood includes two dilemmas that represent the participants' lack of insights about the people who lived in the community where they attended Bright Futures mentoring sessions. The dilemmas in this category are knowing the mentee's family and knowing the residents. The total number of dilemmas in this category was eight (see Table 4-5), or three percent of the total number of dilemmas found in this investigation (see Table 4-1). Dilemmas in this category were mentioned only once by both Annie and Betsy.

Overview of Participants' Resolutions and Roles

As posited by Berlak and Berlak (1981), resolutions to teaching dilemmas often occur in patterns. Annie and Betsy's patterns of resolution were related to the roles they played as mentors. For each participant, the role she played in mentoring will be the backdrop for describing her efforts to identify and resolve dilemmas. As in the Berlaks' (1981) study, this investigation verifies that individuals' "social histories . . . continuously affect their patterns of resolution and their views of the desirability and practicality of resolving differently the dilemmas they face" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p.214). The purpose of examining Annie's and Betsy's dilemmas and resolutions is to provide a set of lenses through which to gain insights by comparing how each participant dealt with problematic situations in the

Bright Futures Mentoring field experience. Insights from this detailed analysis have implications for the preparation of effective teachers of diverse learners.

Participant Number 1 (P1): Annie

Annie was an 18-year-old junior from a suburb of a large South Florida city. Annie described her childhood as difficult. She was raised by her single mother and her grandparents until Annie was 12 years of age. Annie's mother and grandparents suffered from either drug or alcohol abuse. Annie was adopted at the age of thirteen after having spent time in several foster homes.

Annie speaks fondly of her adoptive family. Annie's adoptive father is a police officer, and her adoptive mother is a social worker; her parents take in from one to three foster children on a regular basis. Annie has one biological brother who lives with his adoptive parents and one adoptive brother who is two years younger than Annie. Annie is especially proud of the close relationship she has with her adoptive brother.

Before she was adopted, Annie attended elementary schools in several places in Florida and North Carolina. Annie considers the areas where she lived and went to school to be "ghettos" and that it was not unusual for her to be the only white student in her classes. Her first experience attending a school through all grades (available in the school) came after she began living with her adoptive family. Those four years in high school are considered by Annie to be the best years of her life. She is proud of both her academic and extracurricular accomplishments; Annie had completed her sophomore year in college by the end of twelfth

grade and was a band member in high school. Annie was a member of the band at the university during her first semester in the College of Education.

Annie considers her family to be middle class and financially comfortable. While Annie's parents are capable of supporting her, they have required Annie to live on her own and work toward financial independence. Annie is an ambitious person who worked part time through high school and college and moved into her own apartment in her hometown before leaving to attend the university. Annie measured her successes by the degrees of independence she gained from her endeavors. Annie was particularly proud of having lived on her own for several months and for having completed her Associate's degree while still in high school. Her next goal was successful completion of her first semester at the university.

Annie's decision to become an elementary teacher stems from her adoptive mother's influence. Annie's mother spent many hours around children in her position as a case worker for Child Health Services. Annie volunteered as a mentor for some of her mother's clients. Having been a ward of the State, Annie believed her background prepared her to pursue a career in education. Annie recounted a conversation with her adoptive mother about career choices wherein her mother said, "you're a teacher." Annie agreed and began making plans to pursue a degree in elementary education. Annie's experience with children includes babysitting her younger brother and sister and being around their friends and spending time with the children of pregnant teenage mothers.

Annie had not heard about the Bright Futures Mentoring Program before she began her first semester in the College of Education. She described feeling anxious when she learned that, in addition to what she considered to be a demanding schedule of courses, she was also required to complete a field experience. Annie recalled her reaction to learning that she was to be a mentor: "Oh my God, I have seven classes and they are giving me THIS!" (P1I1 11/30). Annie said that she adjusted quickly to the idea of completing a field experience once she got reassurances from peers and the Director of Bright Futures who was also one of Annie's instructors.

Annie expected to have a unique experience in Bright Futures for two reasons: (a) She was 18 years old; she would likely be within six years of her mentee's age; and (b) Annie had chosen to work with a middle school student; most mentors worked with children of elementary school age. Among Annie's expectations of the field experience was to have a chance to establish a relationship with "someone you know that you can influence their [sic] life" (P1I1 12/16). She also looked forward to learning about lesson planning and getting feedback from an experienced teacher. Once her initial anxiety subsided, Annie looked foward to mentoring and said, "I'm actually really excited. I can't wait" (P1I1 12/24).

Description of Annie's Mentoring Sessions

For Annie, mentoring entailed planning an agenda and leading her mentee through the activities from the plan. The activities that Annie planned typically combined arts and crafts with academic skills practice in writing and reading.

As recommended by the director of Bright Futures, Annie's mentoring sessions included several activities; overplanning was strongly encouraged in both the mentoring handbook and the orientations attended by all mentors. Unless her mentee was resistant, Annie preferred to complete activities in the order in which they appeared on her plans.

Annie conducted mentoring activities in a linear, sequential fashion toward prescribed goals. That is, she followed a series of steps that led to a finished product that was clearly defined. While Annie was dedicated to the process and goals that she planned, she learned early in mentoring that she would seldom see her session plans through to completion on a given day; activities often took longer than Annie expected, so she chose to complete the activities in subsequent sessions rather than abandon them. Annie described her sequential approach to conducting mentoring sessions as follows:

> You like, plan one activity and it takes you the whole entire hour on that one day. And sometimes, it takes even more than that, you have to carry it over to the next time. So like, the other four things on your lesson plan didn't get touched, you know? So, it's basically you try to plan itty bitty little sections, and then you have like, one project. And then one project is what you work on that week, and if you don't get to the others, well, it's when you just cut and paste and you bring them to the next one . . . and make one of them the priority that week. (P1I4 7/3)

Annie practiced this overlapping of short and long term activities and projects. Annie was not always pleased at having to overlap sessions because she thought the teacher who evaluated her plans would notice that Annie's activity plans were repetitive. Annie said, "I'm sure the teacher gets tired of reading the same thing over and over, 'cause

you just don't accomplish it all [in one session]" (P1I4 7/11). Struggling to get through the activities on her plans was a theme throughout Annie's mentoring field experience.

Annie chose to play a role that emphasized monitoring and dispensing information; it was Annie's job to see that her mentee did what she needed to do and had all the information required to complete activities. The first stage in all of Annie's activities included a brief introduction, and she would spend as much time giving directions as was needed by her mentee. Once her mentee began working, Annie assumed the role of observer and evaluator. In a few instances, Annie participated in activities and did the same work as her mentee. Most frequently, however, Annie chose to watch her mentee work and offer comments, suggestions, or directions.

While most of the activities Annie planned required part or all of one mentoring session to complete, Annie chose to engage her mentee in one long term project called a "Moon Journal" (P1I4 7/14). Based on a trade book of the same title, Annie's Moon Journal project spanned several weeks and became a routine part of her mentoring sessions. Moon Journal entries were completed by Annie's mentee at the beginning of mentoring sessions over four weeks. Annie's mentee wrote about her thoughts as she observed the phases of the moon each night prior to mentoring sessions. Annie provided prompts and checked her mentee's work during and after writing.

The majority of Annie's mentoring sessions included brief activities that could be completed in one or two sessions. Annie often included such activities for

motivational purposes. Examples of short term activites or projects included baking cookies, making Halloween decorations, and playing games. Annie used these activities as incentives for her mentee to work on long term projects.

Analysis of field notes from observations revealed that Annie participated actively in her mentoring sessions for an average of 15 minutes per session. Active participation includes completing the same activity as her mentee, reading to her mentee, taking dictation as her mentee talked, or introducing a story or activity. Annie spent the majority of her one hour sessions monitoring her mentee's work, gathering materials, or explaining things to her mentee.

Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach

Annie's mentee was the eldest daughter in a large family headed by a single mother. Annie's mentee was 13 years of age and enrolled in seventh grade at a local middle school. She had participated in mentoring since fourth grade and had shown little improvement in her achievement, though she had been promoted every year. Annie's mentee enjoyed mentoring most when she was allowed to engage in arts and crafts or cooking activities.

Annie realized early in her field experience that her mentee was not doing well in school. As a result, Annie dedicated most of her time trying to fill in what she perceived to be gaps in her mentee's knowledge. Annie's mentee was a part-time special education student, though Annie never used these terms to describe her mentee; it was not clear that Annie was aware that her mentee was assigned to a part-time special education classroom.

At the beginning of Annie's field experience in Bright Futures, Annie planned and attempted enriching activities that were not school-like in order to motivate her mentee. All was well with Annie until she met the site manager of her learning center. In that meeting, which occurred after her second session with her mentee, Annie learned that her mentee was the site manager's daughter. At that time, the site manager expressed interest in seeing Annie work with her mentee on academics. As Annie began to focus on academics, she found that her mentee needed extensive assistance with remedial skills in every subject area, especially literacy.

Knowing how to teach basic skills

After meeting her mentee's mother (the site manager), Annie's orientation to mentoring became more like traditional academic tutoring. From the time of her choice to focus more on academics, the number of dilemmas Annie experienced increased, especially when helping her mentee with remedial work. The dilemma that Annie encountered most frequently in the domain category of knowing how to teach was the dilemma of knowing how or when to help the mentee with basic skills. Annie mentioned dilemmas in this domain 14 times in three interviews, nearly twice as many times as the participant with the next highest number of occurrences (see Table 4-2) in this domain. The number of occurrences for Annie's dilemma in this domain is also revealing in that it is the second most pervasive dilemma experienced by a participant in this study within the category of knowing how to teach.

This dilemma arose from Annie's lack of knowledge about where and when to begin to teach what she considered common, ordinary knowledge and study skills that her mentee had not

mastered. Annie gave an example of the difficulty she had helping her mentee understand why United States servicemen (Annie's boyfriend was in the Army and stationed in Korea) were often required to live abroad:

> Basically, I couldn't get her to understand. I didn't know how to go about starting. I tried starting at the very basis of it all [history of U.S armed forces in Korea], you know? She [the mentee] asked, "Well, if they don't fight, then how do they protect?" I was like, "Well, they are trained in combat, but then they do this . . ." So I tried to start at the very basic level and build it up and that didn't seem to work. So it was just, how could I get her to understand? (P1I5 6/20)

Annie realized that part of the difficulty in helping her mentee was that she had made assumptions about what teaching entailed:

> The dilemma was the fact that I didn't . . . My basic wasn't basic enough. That was, like, . . . her not knowing, I guess, was just a shock. It caught me off guard. And then, when I went to describe it to her, my basics weren't basic enough. And that's when I had to go back. (P1I6 14/9)

The origin of Annie's dilemma was her frustration over her mentee's lack of prerequisite knowledge and skills. Annie did not feel confident in her ability to teach basic skills though she felt confident in her own knowledge about American History and the structure and function of the United States armed forces. This feeling of uncertainty compelled Annie to think about how to help her mentee gain knowledge and when to present new information to her mentee. The difficulty of this dilemma was compounded for Annie since her mentee was observed reacting negatively to mentoring activities that had an academic focus.

Getting or maintaining the mentee's attention

Annie's mentee did not enjoy going to school. By the time Annie's mentee arrived at the learning center, she had spent six hours in school and was ready for a change of pace. From the outset of her field experience, Annie sought to oblige her mentee by planning enriching activities that included time doing art, Annie's mentee's favorite leisure activity; however, after having met the site manager, Annie made her sessions more school-like in an effort to comply with the mother's wishes. For the remainder of Annie's field experience, she spoke often during interviews of having difficulties getting or maintaining her mentee's attention when doing academic activities. She mentioned this dilemma 12 times (see Table 4-1) in three interviews. Annie characterized her mentee as a daydreamer and related how this caused a reoccurring dilemma:

> She [the mentee] always goes back to daydreaming. You know, she'll daydream, I'll redirect her and like ten or fifteen minutes later, [I would have to say] "Whatcha doin'", You know, that kind of thing. She'll . . . it's repetitive. It's always the same thing, basically, . . . you redirect her, she goes back to task. Time elapses and you do it again. (P1I6 7/14)

Annie also considered her mentee's inattention as a departure from her session plans; the tone Annie used, the expressions in her stories, and her body language suggested that Annie considered such departure a nuisance.

Getting the mentee to talk

In Annie's view, conversation was a necessary component of a good mentoring session; however, when sessions were school-like, Annie's mentee occasionally would refuse to talk. For Annie, silence on the part of her mentee was undesirable and a sign that Annie needed to take action.

Hence, Annie mentioned the corresponding dilemma of getting the mentee to talk three times in one interview. Annie gave a vivid description that illustrates how difficult it was for her to elicit conversation when her mentee was reticent:

> She [the mentee] sits there, looks at you. You look at her and you're going through your head, going, "Okay, we've stopped [talking]. I'm looking but she's not talking." You have to think of a question that's not like, "Okay, what's wrong?" You have to think of something like, 'What are you thinking?' Because you just can't go, "What's up?" You can't do that. You have to think of some way to draw her out. It's weird because they last for a couple of seconds but sometimes it seems like for hours. I think it's also because we're still getting to know each other. There's only been like, three sessions. So, we're still trying to get to know each other. We haven't exactly learned to read her completely yet. (P1I3 6/23)

Annie was uncomfortable when the mentee stopped talking with her. Annie also recognized that getting the conversation going was her responsibility. Early in her field experience, Annie learned to expect to have problems communicating with her mentee and that the dilemma that resulted was likely to persist:

> When I asked her [the mentee] what she wanted to bake so I could start planning, I asked her, "Do you want to do cookies, do you want do cupcakes or something?" She goes, "Cupcakes." She looked at me and she goes, 'Will they be just for us?' It was like. . . "If you want." She never gave me a straight answer. I go, "Well, what do you want." And she just sat there and thought but never gave me an answer. We have a couple more weeks before Halloween, though. It'll probably come up again. (P1I3 7/15)

Annie faced a subtle power struggle with her mentee. This dilemma represented the tension between Annie's desire to make progress toward the goals she perceived as most important and her need to maintain a positive, even friendly, relationship with her mentee. This relationship was put to

the test by the conflicting attitudes of the mentee, who wanted to do artwork and leisurely activities, and the site manager, who wanted her daughter to spend time practicing basic skills; Annie was caught in the middle and bore the brunt of her mentee's unwillingness to do school-like work. The result was the mentee's overt and covert inattention, silence, and avoidance of anything with an academic component.

Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Knowing About Her Own Thinking and Learning

Annie experienced frustration related to the ever increasing amount of thinking that it required to function as a preservice teacher and mentor. Annie was aware of the fact that many people could talk openly and at length about their thinking. Despite having to reflect on and write about her thinking explicitly in her course work in the College of Education, Annie seemed to have difficulty articulating her thoughts. Annie said her thinking about dilemmas remained tacit except for her comments about them during interviews. At times, Annie seemed a bit perturbed to have to talk about her thinking related to dilemmas. The following example illustrates how Annie engaged in thinking about dilemmas:

> I don't sit here and go, "Well, let's define a problem . . ." I don't think that way, it's just something I do. You asked me, "Well, do you define . . ." Well, is there a step there in between that? I'm like, "Well, there might be. I just don't think of it. It's just something I do." (P1I5 15/19)

Annie's dilemma of knowing about her thinking and learning surfaced as she struggled to demonstrate how she thought things through for mentoring. Annie knew it was important to think logically; her plans were set up in a logical fashion

and she knew that in order for her mentee to understand complex things, it was necessary to begin with basics. Annie's dilemma stemmed from her inability to talk about her thinking. Annie said:

> I guess when I think, I don't name stuff. And I really don't think in steps. It's just kind of . . . simultaneous, you know? It all kinda, you know . . . I don't know. Most people when you sit down, you don't think, "Well, this was my dilemma, and this is what caused my dilemma, . . ." You don't break stuff down, you just kinda react to it. You don't really . . . I don't know, maybe it's just me. (P1I6 6/22)

At the heart of Annie's dilemma was her preferrence to take her thinking for granted, which conflicted with the expectations of her teacher education program (and the investigator). As a participant in this study and a preservice teacher in a teacher education program that valued reflection, Annie frequently was asked to talk about her thinking. Annie preferred simply to "react". Annie grew tense and anxious when she was asked to describe her thought processes. Her dilemma in this category arose from her discomfort over her inability to discuss her thinking about dilemmas.

Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: The Mentee Lacks Knowledge, Skills, Ability, or Aptitude

The category of domains called knowing about the mentee contains dilemmas related to the participants' cognizance of their mentees' knowledge, skills, and abilities; about the mentees' personalities; about how they might react when having difficulty with academics. Annie talked about dilemmas in this category 11 times in three interviews.

All of the dilemmas Annie mentioned in the category of knowing about the mentee included referrences by the

participants to examples of their mentees' deficient knowledge, skills, ability, or aptitude. Conversely, the dilemmas of knowing how to teach described above arose because the participant had a deficit. Annie mentioned dilemmas in the domain of knowing about the mentee 11 times in three interviews.

Annie had not met with her mentee until her third interview. After her first session with her mentee, Annie noted that her mentee was academically weak. Despite her claim that she was opposed to prejudging the children who participated in Bright Futures, Annie gave an example of how she had begun to form firm opinions about her mentee's capabilities:

> She's [the mentee] writing out her paragraph and she was thinking about it. She does that kind of slow. She likes to think through everything. So I was drawing. I had nothing better to do so I was like, "Okay, I'll leave her alone and let her do her thing" so it won't be like I'm scrutinizing everything she writes down and correct as she goes along. It's better to let her formulize it and then you can go and correct it. (P1I3 5/3)

Though she had spent, at most, one hour with her mentee to this point, Annie seemed certain that her mentee was not working at an academic level befitting her mentee's age and grade. Annie complained that she would likely never complete all of the activities she planned for her sessions because of her mentee's lack of aptitude:

> You take it one word at a time. It does take her a lot longer to do things, so I can't like, most people have five activities, which is like, totally unrealistic for Bright Futures, 'cause you like, plan one activity and it takes you the whole entire hour on that one day. And sometimes, it takes even more than that, you have to carry it over to the next time. So like, the other four things on your lesson plan didn't get touched, you know? (P1I4 7/1)

Annie completed four more sessions by our next interview and had discovered that her mentee had problems with literacy. Reading, in particular, was difficult for Annie's mentee. Annie described how she considered reading to be a dilemma:

> Reading . . . it's a very big dilemma. It screams dilemma there. Um . . . it's just like, she'll [the mentee] be reading, and she's so choppy. It doesn't flow. It's like, ". . . the . . . cat . . . and . . . " It's like, so NOT the way we read, that I don't think she comprehends it when she gets done . . . So I'll have to go back and like, synthesize it for her because the way she reads is so choppy that she's working so hard on getting the words out, that she doesn't comprehend anything. That's why reading written instructions are so hard for her, 'cause by the time she gets to the end of the sentence, she doesn't remember what she read back in the beginning . . . 'cause she was so busy trying to get the words. So I'll ask her to reread it and it'll take her like, four or five times before she can actually go, "Oh, yeah . . . this is what I'm supposed to do." (P1I4 4/35)

Annie's dilemma of the Mentee lacks knowledge, skills, ability, or aptitude stemmed from the frustration Annie felt when her mentee struggled with the prerequisites for completing the activities that Annie had planned. The exasperation Annie felt grew as she completed more sessions. In her fifth interview, Annie described how she had encountered another instance wherein her mentee's knowledge was, in Annie's view, severely lacking:

> Wow! How can you not know what Korea is? There was like, a thing that happened there, you know? I was like, "We have troops, people . . . one of 'em's mine [Annie's boyfriend]" How come it's not . . . the fact that she [the mentee] could just not know what Korea was. I was like, "Where do you think you get Korean food from?" And she's like, "Well, I never thought about it." I was like, "Wow . . . interesting." (P1I5 14/3)

Annie's dilemma was derived from the tension she felt as she was determined not to give up on the goals she wrote on her

activity plans, yet she could not avoid helping her mentee with the basic knowledge and skills her mentee needed.

Annie's Dilemmas of Knowing About People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Mentee's Family

Annie considered herself to be an open-minded person and referred to her having accepted African American culture as an important personal accomplishment. Annie's form of acceptance of African American culture was derived from her belief that she was very knowledgeable about African Americans since she had spent time with her brother's best friend, who was black. She felt so knowledgeable that she did not consider that there were any cultural differences between her and African Americans. Annie described how she disagreed with the notion that the people in the community around her learning center were diverse:

> It wasn't diverse. I already had accepted that culture. I had been exposed to the African American culture. So, to me, they were one and the same as me. They weren't below me, they were one and the same. (P1I6 17/18)

Though Annie had many benevolent notions about her experiences with African Americans and the people involved with Bright Futures, she encountered difficulty relating to her mentee's mother, the site manager. Annie noted that the site manager seemed to treat her differently than she did the teacher who worked at the learning center. Annie considered the site manager's different treatment to be a symptom of a lack of social skills. Annie said the problem was "her (the mentee's) Mom's social skills, stuff like that. Stuff that most people pick up along the way they (the mentee's family) seem to lack" (P1I5 4/10). When asked to elaborate about the difficulty she was having with the site manager, Annie said:

> [The problem is] Social skills . . . Um . . . basic eye

> contact. Stuff like that. Her mom . . . I guess eye contact . . . I don't know if I intimidate her somehow, but doesn't carry on conversations. Really one-worded, . . . one sided conversations. I don't know if it's, I mean she talks with the site manager, or the teacher there. (P1I5 4/20)

Annie's dilemma was rooted in the disparity between Annie's certainty about being well-versed in dealing with African Americans and her confusion over the site manager's reaction; Annie did not know whether to view herself as having a shared culture with the site manager or to acknowledge her diversity. Annie's search for an explanation led her to blame the site manager and the other adults at the learning center for lacking knowledge:

> Her mom and the adults there didn't have as high a vocab[ulary] as I did, you know. And that comes from, I read a lot. So that comes from having that, and they [her mentee's family] don't have exposure to that. So, I mean, stuff like that was different. But the general person wasn't any different than I was. They have feelings, you know. Everyone bleeds red, you know. (P1I5 17/30)

Annie faced this dilemma because she had limited knowledge about the site manager and the other adults who worked at the learning center. Annie's limited knowledge led her to form naive generalizations about the site manager and others, yet at the same time claim that these people were essentially no different from her.

Annie's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution

In Annie's view, people have higher positions in hierarchies because they know more. According to Annie, people in authority have their positions because they are more knowledgeable and are also frequently more sophisticated than their subordinates. In keeping with Annie's framework, Annie believed that her position as a mentor was only one

step above the lowest position in Bright Futures; her mentee held the lowest position. Therefore, Annie considered herself a technical member of the hierarchy since it was her job to carry out the orders of her superior, namely the site manager.

Given Annie's framework, it follows that her main aim in mentoring was to do her duty. For Annie, doing her duty meant fulfilling the discrete set of requirements specified for her position by an authority figure. Consequently, her role in mentoring resembled that of a street level bureaucrat (Weatherly & Lipsky, 1977) in a hierarchical organization. She seemed to rely on strategies she had found useful in her experience as a volunteer with foster children, band member, and fast food restaurant employee. For example, Annie often issued directives to her mentee during mentoring activities; in her work as a fast food restaurant employee, Annie was accustomed to telling her subordinates what to do or being told what to do by her superiors. Annie relied on this strategy since she viewed herself as an authority figure over her mentee. While Annie viewed herself as having authority over her mentee, she described how she felt subordinate to her mentee's mother. Annie said, "I was trying to follow what her (the mentee's) mother told me because her mother doesn't want her (the mentee) to do art. She spends all her time drawing and her mom wants her to do her schoolwork" (P1I3 2/5). Following this meeting, Annie changed her approach to mentoring from providing enriching activities that were negotiated with the mentee, to planning lessons with an emphasis on homework and enrichment activities only as supplements to the academic work.

Annie also relied on what she knew about doing one's duty from people with whom she had close relationships: Her father--a police officer, her mother--a social worker, and her boyfriend--a soldier in the United States Army. As a result, Annie's strategies for resolving dilemmas in mentoring resembled those she had used or knew were used by the most influential people in her life.

Annie had two objectives in resolving dilemmas: (a) fix the problem, and (b) monitor the situation. These two objectives denote the main categories of Annie's resolution patterns and were derived from analysis of the kinds of resolutions Annie described or demonstrated.

Resolution Pattern 1: Fix the Problem

Annie's resolutions in this category reflect her efforts to combat dilemmas by acquiring and using what she considered to be the proper techniques of teaching. Annie seemed to view teaching as a technical endeavor from the beginning of her first semester. In her Images of Teaching Assignment, completed during the first week of her Research in Elementary Education course, Annie stated:

> I want to be open minded to new techniques and to new technology . . . . I need to learn the appropriate techniques in order to give the children a fuller opportunity to learn . . . [When the assignment required Annie to describe what she thought she might learn in the Research course:] . . . New teaching technology as far as techniques go and how to deal with diverse populations. (Images of Teaching Assignment, 8/97)

For Annie, good teaching required a specific set of proper implements or tools. Similarly, Annie believed it was incumbent on her to find out what tools were necessary for helping her mentee complete activities. As a result, fixing the problem was the strategy Annie used most frequently. Of

73 occurrences wherein Annie mentioned resolutions for dilemmas, she mentioned fixing the problem 33 times (see Table 4-6). Within this pattern of resolution were two strategies that Annie used to fix the problem: (a) Giving the right answer, and (b) making information more basic.

Table 4-6
Annie's Resolution Pattern and Strategy Counts

Fix the problem		
Strategy 1:	Giving the right answer	19
Strategy 2:	Making information more basic	14
Monitor the situation		
Strategy 1:	Managing or controlling the focus, pace, or topic of mentoring	31
Strategy 2:	Issuing directives or giving directions	6
Strategy 3:	Adjusting the activity or plan	3
	Total	73

Strategy 1: Giving the right answer

Annie's second overall most frequently used strategy for resolving dilemmas was transmitting or dispensing information. For Annie, this meant giving the correct answers, or those appearing in textbooks or accepted as common knowledge by well-educated people (like herself). Annie mentioned giving the right answer 19 times; seven times in the dilemma category of knowing about the mentee, six times in the dilemma category of knowing how to teach, and six times in the dilemma category of knowing myself (see Table 4-6).

Annie had come to place a high value on education and travel as a result of having lived with her adoptive family. Because education was a high priority in her life, Annie felt proud and confident about the extent of the general knowledge she had at her disposal. Annie was incredulous at her mentee's lack of knowledge and described her mentee's view of the world as "tunnel vision" (P1I5 2/11). Therefore, Annie considered it her responsibility to broaden her mentee's perspective so that it more closely resembled her own. Annie described it this way:

> I guess a mentor is there to basically open up a new door; that there is something outside of their little community. I've found that a lot with [her mentee], that she doesn't understand "university", you know? It's not like, . . . she lives in [their hometown], yet . . . she doesn't understand that. I didn't even live in [her hometown] and I understood the extent of the university. And she lives right here, like, less than fifteen minutes away and she doesn't understand that. I think it's, a mentor is basically just to open up the door that there is a world outside. (P1I5 1/19)

Since Annie's mentee lacked what Annie believed was critical and basic knowledge, Annie believed her role entailed transmitting that correct knowledge about the world to her mentee. Annie described how she transmitted the knowledge her mentee needed in order to participate in a conversation about Annie's boyfriend:

> Sometimes I have to realize she may not know this. So I have to go back and like fix stuff up. Like I said, "There's five branches that's why the Pentagon . . . ." Like, the pentagon to her is a shape. So she's like, "What's the Pentagon?" I'm like, "It's a building . . . has five sides, each one for each branch . . . ." She's like, "It [has] a shape?" I told her "They call it the Pentagon because it does have five sides."(P1I5 10/4)

Annie resolved the dilemma of her mentee lacks basic knowledge by telling her mentee what she needed to know. In

the example above, Annie was interested in maintaining the momentum of the conversation about her boyfriend's status in the Army. She simply told her mentee the facts needed to understand what was meant by "Pentagon." In Annie's view, this approach was beneficial because it provided information to fill in the gaps in her mentee's knowledge and it was efficient for maintaining the pace of the activity.

Strategy 2: Making information more basic

Annie believed it was her job to help her mentee learn things that were often difficult or sophisticated. Annie's strategy for carrying out her responsibilities was to make such information more basic so that her mentee could understand it. In Annie's view, making information more basic had two benefits; when she simplified information for her mentee, she was teaching her mentee the information she lacked. Making information more basic also helped Annie make progress toward completing her plans for the session; hence, Annie's problem was fixed.

Annie discovered early in her field experience that her mentee's knowledge base had many gaps with regard to what Annie considered to be common knowledge. This situation was compounded when the activities Annie planned could not be completed unless her mentee gained some prerequisite knowledge. Frequently, Annie addressed the problem of her mentee lacks basic knowledge by simply telling her mentee answers. At other times, Annie found it necessary to explain the fundamental elements of concepts, or make things more basic. Annie mentioned the resolution strategy of making information more basic 14 times; she mentioned this strategy 12 times when discussing her resolutions for dilemmas of

knowing how to teach, one time in the dilemma category of knowing myself, and one time in the dilemma category of knowing the people in the neighborhood (see Table 4-6).

When facing the dilemma of making information more basic, Annie seemed to default to making assumptions about what a sixth grade student ought to know. These assumptions created dilemmas for Annie when she began an activity and discovered that her mentee was not ready to proceed due to insufficient prior knowledge. Annie gave an example related to the discussion she had with her mentee about Annie's boyfriend who was in the Army and had spent time in Texas and South Korea:

> I didn't expect her not to know where Korea . . . . Korea I can almost understand. But Texas, that's like the biggest state in our section of the world. I didn't expect her not to understand that. That really caught me off guard. And I didn't see that as a dilemma right away, so I guess that's why I didn't define right off the bat. 'Cause I went back to basics to explain it to her and my basics weren't basic enough. That's why I had to slow down and redo it. And I think that's when I found that it was a dilemma . . . was when I realized my basics weren't basic enough. (P1I6 5/11)

Annie continued and described how she felt caught in a cycle that seemed endless:

> That wasn't easily solved, 'cause it's like a totality. It was like real circular, it just fed over itself. Whereas the daydreaming, a simple question, you know, redirection or something and she was easily back to task. It [redirecting] wasn't like this big round thing. Well, [In the discussion about Texas and Korea] I'd ask her a question then that'd be something else and the given task was not attended to. (P1I6 5/16)

While Annie recognized the importance of imparting knowledge to her mentee, the issue of losing momentum and not completing her plans stood out as the most significant consequences of her mentee's lacking knowledge. Annie, then,

faced two dilemmas that originated as she made assumptions about what her mentee knew; she described how these dilemmas were intertwined:

> I can see it like . . . you have the [initial] dilemma [of her mentee's lack of knowledge], which caught me off guard, I went back to the basics and then I slowed down, but then, to me, I had to go back 'cause that created another dilemma that I wasn't prepared for. And that's when I realized that my basics weren't basic enough and then I had to go back. So to me, it is a round thing. It is never ending. One dilemma can cause something else, you know? Almost like taking the lesser of two evils, you know? You don't know if you should continue on with this discussion or if you should try to make it basic until they get off task with what you're doing. P1I6 5/33)

It is not clear here which of the dilemmas is the lesser evil; however, Annie spent a lot of time telling her mentee things the mentee did not know. While Annie considered deviation from her plans to be a dilemma, Annie chose to help her mentee learn new things rather than complete her planned activities; this confirmed the necessity for using the strategy of making information more basic and also corroborates Annie's technical orientation in mentoring.

Resolution Pattern 2: Monitoring the Situation

Annie described a pattern of resolving dilemmas that helped her set and maintain clear lines for distinguishing her role from her mentee's role. Since Annie believed she had higher status than her mentee, she saw it as part of her responsibility to observe and exert control over her mentee; therefore, Annie adopted a set of strategies that seem consistent with what she had either witnessed or participated in firsthand. Annie's resolution pattern of monitoring the situation involved her efforts toward: (a) managing or controlling the focus, pace, or topic of mentoring

activities; (b) issuing directives or giving directions; and (c) adjusting the activity or plan. Annie mentioned monitoring the situation 40 times (see Table 4-6).

Strategy 1: Managing or controlling the focus, pace, or topic of mentoring activities

Annie monitored activities largely for the purpose of acquiring or transmitting information that was necessary for planning or implementing activities. She mentioned using this strategy 31 times; 26 of these occurrences were mentioned when Annie discussed dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach, two occurences were mentioned with dilemmas of knowing about the mentee, two occurrences were mentioned with dilemmas of knowing myself, and one occurrence was mentioned with dilemmas of knowing about the people in the neighborhood.

Annie felt compelled to keep her mentee busy. On occasion, Annie also needed information about her mentee's level of interest in planned activities in order to keep her mentee on task. When facing dilemmas related to getting or maintaining her mentee's attention, Annie often used questions to focus her mentee's attention on her task and described her strategy like this:

> I'll be sitting there, and she'll be just like, not there. She'll have her pen and paper, and she'll be sitting there and I'm not so sure if she's thinking about what she's doing, or what it is . . . she could be thinking, but she's not. So I'll ask her, "What'cha thinkin'?" Sometimes she'll tell me one thing, and sometimes I'll get "Baking" out of her. Or she'll just be so thrilled with like, um . . . I know a couple of people were playing hangman, she was so enthralled with that, . . . or other people . . . or she'll look away. Stuff like that. (P1I4 12/25)

In this situation, Annie was not insistent upon her mentee

answering the question; rather, Annie sought confirmation that her mentee was unengaged and gathered information that might help to refocus her mentee's attention. Even if the mentee was reticent, Annie's rhetorical question would serve to remind the mentee about what was expected. Annie called this strategy "redirection" (P1I5 11/22). Annie described redirection as a management strategy as follows:

> I have to realize, well, wow she's daydreaming. And then it's just a redirection . . . or a question. A redirection can be, "Well, what were you thinking . . . what were we supposed to be doing?" And that'll work the first time, so that's usually solved. And then she'll go right back to what she's doing. (P1I5 11/22)

To Annie, redirections were a necessary reaction to her mentee's action. In Annie's view, redirecting her mentee was simply a routine teaching technique or what teachers are supposed to do to manage or control the focus or pace of an activity. Redirections were effective for getting Annie's mentee back on task, and they reinforced Annie's and her mentee's roles and duties; Annie's job was to keep the mentee engaged while the mentee's job was to complete the activities.

Strategy 2: Issuing directives or giving directions

Annie attributed certain types of communication to members of hierarchies based on their relative positions; people in high places issue mandates and proclamations, while people in low places spend a lot of time listening and following directions. Annie considered herself to have higher status than her mentee; therefore, Annie established clear parameters for the roles she and her mentee would play in mentoring. Annie mentioned using the strategy of issuing directives or giving directions six times; four times with

dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach and two times with dilemmas of knowing about the mentee.

Compared to her mentee, Annie was an expert at almost everything. In Annie's view, experts are charged with the responsibility of showing novices the way to proficiency. In mentoring sessions, Annie followed this scheme by leading her mentee through lessons and giving directions when her mentee needed them. Annie described how she gave directions in a baking activity:

> Her big thing that I'm looking for on the baking is that she has to read the instructions to me, because she has a really hard time with like, um, inflection[al] endings and all that. She has a real problem with that . . . prefixes and suffixes, she has a real problem with those, but she can read you the words . . . the root word, but anything around that, she can't do. And the scarecrow puppet was good and helpful with that because on the ditto, it gave you how to make it, so I made her read step one, this is what we're going to do. (P1I4 1/19)

At other times, Annie described how she was more assertive and used directives to keep her mentee on a straight and narrow track:

> But the thing is, when she does that, . . . like, when she starts understanding, she'll start asking questions which cause more dilemmas. So, you basically . . . you just have to slow her down. Tell her to be quiet for a second. Like, "Okay, come on, let me do the first thing before you do the second." (P1I5 7/30)

Annie believed that to be successful in mentoring meant maintaining control explicitly since she did not consider her mentee capable of self-direction. As this assumption fit well with Annie's perception of the hierarchy of power in mentoring, Annie found it reasonable and efficient to assume a role as a traditional, technically-oriented tutor.

Strategy 3: Adjusting the activity or plan

Annie preferred to have predetermined set of plans for mentoring sessions. Her idea of a satisfactory plan was that her mentee completed all of the required tasks in the order Annie specified. Annie's idea of a satisfactory session was that she and her mentee would complete all of the activities on her session plan for that day.

As noted above, Annie knew that her mentee lacked the prerequisite knowledge needed for many activities. As a result, Annie often had to change her plans and spend time in the session talking about things that she had not anticipated. Annie referred to these adjustments to her plans as having to "go back, . . . slow down and redo it" (P1I6 5/16). For Annie, having to remediate, change the pace, or reconfigure her plans was not a completely tangential endeavor. Instead, it meant her plans had to be set aside temporarily until the prerequisites were covered. These adjustments did more to change sessions than plans; in Annie's view, not getting through everything she planned was unacceptable. Nonetheless, Annie felt obliged to teach her mentee the missing information and would often deviate from her plans temporarily in order to accomodate her mentee's lack of knowledge.

Annie mentioned using her strategy of adjusting the activity or plan three times; two times with dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach and one time with dilemmas of knowing myself. Annie described her strategy of adjusting the activity within the context of an impromptu Social Studies lesson that ended up taking an entire session:

> [The mentee] and I were talking about states, and she went through my wallet one day and she found a picture of

> my boyfriend. And he was in uniform. She found this very like, "Wow! Look!", you know? She asked where he was, and I tried to explain that he's in Texas and he's going to Korea. And her knowledge of like, of just where the states are . . . I pointed out, like, "Well, this is where Texas is." But she doesn't understand the distance . . . I couldn't get her to understand . . . that frustrated me at first. 'Cause I was trying to explain it to her and she's like, she understood the obvious. Military, Army, you know. What she didn't understand . . . Like, she just did not understand the whole thing . . . And then I tried to explain to her, like, we're the world power and she's like, "Why's that?" I'm like, "The economy." And it was just one thing after another that she just . . . I think it was so much, that she just . . . it was on too big a scale . . . she kind of just gives me that look. Like, "You're talking about what?" She usually says, "I don't get that, are you serious?" You know, that kind of thing. And I'll be like, "Okay, I've got to take her back." And it's funny to me how all she was doing was, she was going through looking for something. I told her to go get my wallet, she went out to get it and she found the picture and that started a whole snowball effect. (P1I5 2/26)

Annie felt compelled to fill in the gaps in her mentee's knowledge, even when it meant facing the "snowball effect" of having to pospone the remainder of her plans for the session. Annie summed up her strategy this way:

> You have to carry it [the original plan] over to the next time. So, like, the other four things on your lesson plan didn't get touched . . . you just cut and paste and you bring them [the uncompleted activities] to the next one [session] and make one of them [the uncompleted activities] the priority that [next] week. (P1I4 7/1)

Summary

Annie was a committed mentor who persevered in the Bright Futures field experience despite facing a variety of dilemmas that threatened her plans and autonomy. Annie mentioned pedagogical dilemmas most frequently, especially dilemmas of knowing how to teach subject matter and knowing how to get and maintain interest. In particular, Annie

mentioned most often dilemmas of knowing how or when to help the mentee with basic skills and getting or maintaining the mentee's attention. She mentioned the dilemmas of knowing how or when the mentee with basic skills 14 times and the dilemma of getting or maintaining the mentee's attention 12 times. The category of dilemmas related to knowing the mentee contains Annie's third largest clustering of dilemmas, wherein she mentioned her mentee's lack of knowledge, skills, abilities or aptitude 11 times.

To resolve dilemmas, Annie chose strategies that ensured her status as her mentee's monitor and the source of the unknown information her mentee needed. Fixing the problem and monitoring the situation were Annie's most frequently used techniques when she faced dilemmas. For Annie, fixing the problem meant giving her mentee the right answers when asked. Fixing the problem also meant that when her mentee was stuck on a problem, it was Annie's responsibility to make the information more basic so that her mentee could comprehend it. Monitoring the situation included Annie's efforts at controlling the focus, pace, or topics of mentoring sessions. Annie also monitored her mentee by issuing directives or giving directions andng the activity or plan to fit the circumstance.

Participant Number 2 (P2): Betsy

Betsy was a 20-year-old junior from a suburb of a south Florida city. Betsy described her upbringing as "middle class" (P2I1 2/31). Betsy's father had a career in the military and worked two jobs while Betsy was living at home. Betsy's mother was a housewife until all of her children were of school age, then she took a position as a teacher's aide

at the neighborhood elementary school. Betsy is from a large family of seven children; Betsy has five older siblings and one who is younger. Her older brothers and sister have children. Betsy is a very proud aunt who dotes on her nieces and nephews and spend time babysitting them when she can. According to Betsy, the family home is like a "day care" (P2I1 6/5) since there are always a number of children visiting. Betsy spent a significant amount of time around children prior to leaving home for college.

Betsy's school background was punctuated by frequent moves while her father was in the military. Betsy spent her first two years in elementary schools on Air Force bases both in and outside of the United States. The family settled in Florida when Betsy was in third grade, when Betsy began attending the neighborhood elementary school. Her junior high experience was significantly different from her elementary and high school years. Betsy described the neighborhood around the junior high school as very poor and most of the students who were not from the immediate neighborhood were bused in. Though the area around the school was frightening, Betsy said she felt safe and enjoyed being around other students from diverse backgrounds; Betsy liked the school so well that she rejected her parents' offer to place her in private parochial school.

After graduating from the large suburban senior high school near her home, Betsy came to the university where, in addition to her studies, she has worked as a resident assistant hall director. Her responsibilities as an "RA" include planning and implementing programs for 47 student residents in her dormitory. According to Betsy, having to

conduct programs and spending time counseling dormitory residents makes being an RA similar to teaching.

When Betsy was asked to discuss her choice of majors, without hesitation she said, "I've actually always wanted to go into education" (P2I1 5/13). Her only deviation away from pursuing a career as a teacher was to declare her major to be child psychology; she changed her major back to education after six weeks. Prior to her first semester in the elementary education program, Betsy had spent countless hours babysitting for the children of family and friends. To gain additional experience working with children (and in addition to her school and RA responsibilities), Betsy volunteered in classrooms in two elementary schools, one kindergarten and one third grade class. Betsy worked as a tutor for a remedial reading program wherein she was assigned to work with one child for up to two hours per week. Betsy also volunteered as a classroom aide and completed a field observation project for a child development course; in both, Betsy found opportunities to establish relationships with children.

Betsy was very enthusiastic about participating in a field experience during her first semester in the College of Education and expected Bright Futures to be similar to other fieldwork she had completed, She saw it as an opportunity to continue her ongoing efforts to spend as much time around children as possible; Betsy claimed to go through "children withdrawals" (P2I5 2/50) when she was not able to spend time around children. The chance to work one-on-one as a mentor was also inviting to Betsy because she would be able to practice lesson planning as well as develop a close

relationship with a child. Betsy considered herself an explorer by nature who was anxious to see what lay ahead in all of her pursuits. She also claimed to be ready to accept her mentee regardless of her personality or temperament; as long as the child liked her, Betsy was convinced she could handle anything. Betsy looked forward with great excitement to participating in Bright Futures.

Description of Betsy's Mentoring Sessions

Betsy viewed mentoring as a continuation of her personal quest for opportunities to establish caring relationships with children. Betsy's trademark in mentoring sessions was her flexibility. For Betsy, mentoring session plans merely provided a point of departure or a loose framework around which sessions could be conducted. Betsy was willing to abandon her plans altogether if a spontaneous activity became more interesting for her mentee. As Betsy's mentee was bright and academically successful, Betsy did not feel compelled to make mentoring resemble schoolwork; rather, Betsy preferred to respond to the interests and needs of her mentee as they arose.

Betsy's mentoring sessions rarely included routines or rigid patterns. Instead, Betsy preferred to negotiate with her mentee as to what they would do together. Some examples of activities Betsy and her mentee's mentoring sessions included playing board games, writing a play, spending time playing computer games, making seasonal holiday arts and crafts, making snacks, and reading books. Betsy listed and described such activities on her session plans, which served as a menu from which her mentee could choose based on her interest. Many times, Betsy and her mentee would construct

activities spontaneously when none of the activities on the session plan suited their needs.

When she found that an activity held her mentee's attention, Betsy would allow as much time as possible for her mentee to complete it. Betsy was always ready with supplemental activities whenever needed and listed such activities on her session plans. Betsy described her approach to planning and her view of the importance of flexibility in mentoring this way:

> I know she likes certain things and so I try and schedule them and we can do it. And I have other ideas of things to do and we don't get to it because she wants to play Carmen San Diego or she wants to do the spelling bee and whatever. But those are all good too, so I don't mind. I just keep moving the other ideas on and say, "Well, we'll do that next week then." (P2I6 5/6)

Betsy did not consider giving in to her mentee's wishes to be detrimental or undesirable for a successful mentoring session. As a result, many of her sessions were adaptations of what she had written on her session plans. Betsy altered her flexible approach once during a field experience that her mentee did not understand how multiplication worked and had done poorly on her schoolwork. In that situation, Betsy built in time for working on mathematics skills and drills during three weeks of sessions. After the mathematics exercises, Betsy's mentee had discretion over the choices of activities.

Betsy chose to play a role that emphasized her mentee's enjoyment of the time they spent together; seeing her mentee's enjoyment of an activity was Betsy's primary criterion for evaluating the success of her session. In Betsy's view, it was her job to provide ideas for brainstorming and support for her mentee during activities.

Examples of support that Betsy provided included providing materials and supplies, asking permission from the Bright Futures personnel to leave the learning center, and providing prompts or asking guiding questions as her mentee worked on academic skills.

Data from observations shows that Betsy also acted as a model for her mentee, demonstrating how to complete tasks, how to practice metacognition, how to make arts and craft items, and how to read aloud with proper intonation. Betsy also switched roles with her mentee for the purpose of modeling. For example, when they decided to write a play, Betsy told her mentee to tell the story and Betsy took dictation. On many occasions during Betsy's field experience, the lines between mentor (teacher) and mentee (learner) were blurred as Betsy relied on her experience working with children (her nieces, nephews, children she worked with as a volunteer or babysitter) or intuition to tell her what role to play during mentoring sessions.

Betsy and her mentee engaged in between two and seven activities per session during the ten week field experience. Betsy's mentee was highly motivated to use the computer at the learning center, so Betsy dedicated the majority of her hour-long sessions to computer time when her mentee selected that option. On other occasions, Betsy's mentee was highly distractible, and they changed activities several times according to Betsy's mentee's attention span. The only routine that Betsy repeated throughout the field experience was to dedicate some time during each session to sharing what had transpired in their lives since their last session.

As the majority of Betsy's and her mentee's sessions were highly interactive, Betsy spent much of her time during sessions talking with her mentee. Both Betsy and her mentee were highly verbal and enjoyed their conversations. But not all of their sessions were filled with conversation. When her mentee completed academic tasks or worked alone with manipulatives or art materials, Betsy acted as an observer or monitor. Betsy maintained a balance between giving feedback and asking questions while her mentee worked. Betsy also maintained a balance between seriousness and humor. Laughing, joking, and teasing were common occurrences during Betsy's sessions.

Betsy's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach

Figuring out how to be an effective mentor proved a challenge for Betsy; she mentioned dilemmas of knowing how to teach 44 times (see Table 4-2). Despite the number of dilemmas Betsy encountered in mentoring, she was enamored with her mentee. From the first minutes of their meeting, Betsy and her mentee worked very hard to form a close relationship. Betsy was thrilled that one of her mentee's first acts was to give Betsy a hug.

Betsy learned that her mentee was in the enrichment program at the neighborhood elementary school and that her mentee came to her first session with many ideas for activities. Betsy's mentee was nine years old, in third grade, and had participated in Bright Futures since first grade. Everything Betsy said about her mentee was positive and upbeat; her mentee shared Betsy's outgoing and affectionate personality; to Betsy, that meant success was a foregone conclusion. By her first full mentoring session,

Betsy learned that her mentee was indeed very bright and that it was going to be a challenge planning activities that would keep her mentee's interest.

Knowing how to assess her mentee's competence

While Betsy's mentee was placed in a gifted program and made good grades in school, she struggled when it came to understanding mathematics at the conceptual level. Betsy's willingness to emphasize her mentee's strengths and lack of knowledge about how to evaluate her mentee's level of understanding led to Betsy's dilemma of knowing how to assess her mentee's competence. Betsy mentioned this dilemma five times (see Table 4-2) in three interviews.

Betsy accepted full responsibility for the dilemma of knowing how to assess her mentee's competence. In Betsy's view, it was not up to the mentee to tell the mentor when the mentee needed help with academics. Betsy said, "I don't expect her to tell me, 'Well, I can do this, and this, and this . . .' It's my job to figure out what she can do" (P2I6 9/20). By the seventh week of the field experience, Betsy discovered her tendency to focus on her mentee's positive attributes and overlook signs that her mentee was not gifted in all areas. Betsy discovered this tendency after having helped her mentee with homework she said, "I had a higher notion of her [the mentee's] abilities than actually where they are, which led me not to actually work on it. I just assumed that what she's getting in school, . . . she understands" (P2I6 9/5). This dilemma illuminates the conflict between Betsy's entering notions about her mentee and evidence to the contrary that her mentee presented in mentoring sessions. Once Betsy noticed that her mentee did

not understand basic multiplication, she realized that not only did she lack assessment strategies, but she also did not know such strategies were necessary. Betsy described her lack of knowledge about assessment in this way:

> I had no clue that she wasn't doing well in multiplication until she said, "You know, I don't think I'm doing real well in this." We had not gone that far, . . . she knew the basics, . . . and those were the ones she could, like, memorize. So I never realized that she really doesn't understand multiplication . . . I had sort of taken it for granted that she understood it because she really loves school and she was doing real well . . . and so it was a dilemma in that we're going back to it. (P2I6 6/15)

When asked about whether she had conducted any assessment activities at the outset of the field experience, Betsy described her early approach to assessment this way:

> I didn't go far enough. I didn't push her limits. [I didn't ask] "Well, can you divide? How far can you go in multiplication?" I asked her some basics, . . . she could do them. And, like, [I told myself] "She must understand multiplication." You know, I didn't ask her, "What is multiplication? What have you learned about it?" . . . or anything. So, I probably should have at the beginning . . . taking her as far as I could. (P2I6 8/28)

Betsy faced this dilemma because she did not know that her mentee could give correct answers to questions about basic mathematics and not have conceptual understanding of the material. Because her mentee could recite answers to basic multiplication problems, Betsy assumed that meant her mentee understood what she was doing. At the early stages of her field experience, Betsy did not know that knowledge and understanding are not synonymous.

Getting or maintaining the mentee's attention

Betsy discovered how challenging it could be to work with a child who is intelligent, inquisitive, and who thrives

on personal interaction. From her first session, Betsy struggled to get and keep her mentee's attention. Betsy was the participant who mentioned this dilemma most often; she talked about getting or maintaining her mentee's attention 17 times in five interviews.

Though she did not feel prepared to deal with the challenges of working with a highly distractible child, Betsy accepted that her mentee could not stay focused at all times and that the mentee's inattentiveness was a natural thing. Betsy said, "Kids don't have that long of an attention span and I have ten nieces and nephews so I frequently bore them" (laughs) (P2I3 9/26). Betsy believed that losing her mentee's attention was a natural occurrence that was expected and conceded that the responsibility for dealing with this dilemma did not necessarily lie with the mentee; rather, it was her problem. Betsy said, "The thing is, with her, you have to keep her attention, like, if we do one activity for too long, she'll get really bored with it, so we have to make sure we keep going" (P2I3 4/20). Betsy prioritized getting and keeping her mentee's attention over attaining her objectives for sessions. Betsy described it this way:

> I was reading [parts of the book] to her, but after, like, three or four pages, 'cause they're all, like, content, . . . not that many pictures, Um, . . . her mind started to wander,she started looking around at the other kids, so that's when I'm like, "Let's change activities." And that's when we played Yahtzee. (P2I3 5/16)

Rather than viewing this dilemma as an indictment of her inabilities as a future teacher, Betsy saw it as a signal that a change was needed. Though this was the most pervasive dilemma she faced, Betsy decided in advance that she was going to view the adversity as a learning experience. Betsy

summed up her outlook this way: "You can plan things down to the last detail; I do that. But it rarely ever happens that way" (P2I4 4/32).

Getting the mentee to talk

Betsy's mentee was a precocious, happy, and highly verbal child. Betsy shared these attributes and got along well with her mentee from the first minutes of making her acquaintance. As a result, Betsy mentioned only once the dilemma of getting the mentee to talk. This dilemma was an anomaly; something that the mentee considered traumatic had happened prior to a mentoring session and on that day, Betsy's mentee was visibly upset when she entered the learning center:

> Wednesday, . . . Um . . . she [the mentee] was really like, kind of upset about something that happened at school. She wouldn't tell me what it is. She was like, all sad and I'm like, "What's wrong?' She's like, 'I just don't want to talk about it right now' I go, 'Well, is it something at school?' She's like, 'Yes, I just don't want to talk about it right now.' She was all sad, and I was so upset. (P2I4 2/21)

Betsy was torn between pressing her mentee for more information and respecting her mentee's right to privacy. Betsy knew that she was not a member of her mentee's family, hence it was not her place to get involved in every aspect of her mentee's life. Betsy also felt tension when she realized that not doing anything to help her mentee with her sadness would seem callous. The essence of this dilemma was Betsy's having to perform a delicate balancing act between maintaining a close relationship with her mentee and violating her mentee's privacy.

Betsy's Dilemma of Knowing the Mentee: Mentee Demonstrates Resistance

Betsy mentioned a dilemma that arose from a situation in which her mentee demonstrated resistant behavior. For Betsy, this was out of the ordinary. Betsy's mentee was typically enthusiastic about the activities that Betsy planned. Observation data shows that Betsy and her mentee frequently alternated taking charge when deciding which activities to try and when to try them. As confirmation of her flexible approach, Betsy said,

> Well, I think I'm more focused on what [my mentee] wants. I will change almost anything I plan to do something that she wants [to do] . . . I just try to love her as much as possible and everything will go from there. (P2I5 7/54)

Betsy preferred not to assume the role of disciplinarian; such an approach, in Betsy's view, would diminish the caring relationship she had formed with her mentee. Furthermore, Betsy's mentee responded very positively to the way Betsy approached mentoring.

An anomalous dilemma occurred during a field trip that took place on an evening before Halloween. Near the end of the field trip, Betsy's mentee was displeased at the prospect of having to go home. Twice during the field trip, Betsy's mentee stated that she did not want their field trip to end, though the time Betsy had allotted for the trip was expiring and Betsy's mentee's mother expected her daughter home at a designated time. Betsy had to enforce the agenda that her mentee's mother had approved. She responded by taking on an authoritarian role as her mentee's resistance made such an approach necessary.

The first episode of Betsy's mentee's resistance occurred outside of the haunted house, the primary destination of the field trip. The haunted house staff adjusted the number and kind of scary performances done for the patrons based on their requests. Betsy's mentee went through the haunted house twice, once in a group that requested a mild performance, and once with a group that requested an extreme performance. Betsy's mentee said, "I wanna go again" when she decided to visit the haunted house a third time. Betsy said, "It was getting late and I was going, 'No, no. You've done both extremes and you're not doing the middle'" (P2I5 2/11).

Once in the car, Betsy's mentee again resisted having to end the field trip. In our interview, Betsy said, "On the ride home, she [the mentee] was like, 'I don't wanna go home. I wanna go about some more.' I said, 'It's 8:30 and it's time for bed.' She said, 'We don't have bedtimes.' I said, 'I doubt it'" (P2I5 2/15). Betsy felt forced to assume an authoritarian role, which contrasted with what both Betsy and her mentee were accustomed during mentoring sessions. Typically, Betsy was willing to change her plans or abandon them altogether if it meant her mentee would be pleased.

Clearly, Betsy's mentee was testing the limits of her relationship with Betsy, as well as Betsy's will and authority. Both of Betsy's mentee's requests placed Betsy in a difficult position: Betsy wanted to enjoy spending leisure time together with her mentee; however, Betsy's mentee's resistance forced Betsy to choose between pleasing her mentee and honoring her agreement with her mentee's mother about the schedule for the field trip. Betsy described her dilemma

this way:

> You know, you don't always have to say yes, but I feel bad if I don't. She [the mentee] wanted to stay longer [at the haunted house], I'm like, "I know, but NO, you can't and that's all there is to it." I don't want to . . . to deny them [sic] things. (P2I5 8/52)

Betsy's Dilemmas of Knowing the People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Mentee's Family

Betsy perceived her mentee as intelligent, studious, pleasant, and outgoing; she could be both diplomatic and friendly when working with others. Additionally, Betsy noted that her mentee was physically healthy, always appearing well-fed and well-rested.

Despite Betsy's positive assessment of her mentee, she wrestled with a dilemma that arose from her assumptions about her mentee's family. Betsy's mentee lived with her mother and an older sister; the elder daughter was in high school. Betsy's mentee's mother worked nights at a hospital, so the elder daughter cared for Betsy's mentee during the day. This situation caused Betsy to be concerned that her mentee's mother was taking proper care of Betsy's mentee. When asked about her reaction to her mentee's family situation early in the field experience Betsy said, "I went to visit her mom for the first time. And . . . she's like a really nice woman, though she didn't have a clue which day (her mentee) came and saw me or anything. Which was kind of weird" (P2I4 1/4). Betsy spoke about this meeting with her mentee's mother in a later interview and described how her dilemma originated:

> I've only met her mother that one time and that's because for some reason, she wasn't working that day. 'Cause normally she's always working when I'm there [at the learning center] . . . but at the same time, she didn't know, like, what we did when we were there. So she's like, "Do you guys do school stuff?" I was like,

> "Yeah, but we also do, you know, the fun things." She's like, "Well, okay, 'cause I want her [Betsy's mentee] to be concentrating on school." And I was like, "Well, yeah, we're doing that." So, she asked me, "So, what time do you come?" I'm like, I was telling her, but it's understandable, 'cause she's not there. (P2I7 4/8)

In a later interview, Betsy describes how she made observations about how her mentee's family functioned:

> Her [the mentee] mother trusts her daughter, I mean, the older daughter that watches [the mentee]. I mean, she [the older daughter] pretty much is raising her, her mom is working and her sister . . . she's the one who is taking care of [the mentee] everyday. She knows what days I come and she knows what activities we're doing, and she's the one that asks when to bring back activities and stuff. So someone's watching out for her. It's not like she's being neglected or anything. It's just, her mom's not there during the day. (P2I7 4/31)

Betsy's dilemma revolved around her difficulty discerning the assumptions upon which she could rely; she could give her mentee's mother the benefit of the doubt and trust her observations that all was well, or she could assume that her mentee's mother's absence meant that she did not care for her child. In either case, Betsy's dilemma was caused by her lack of knowledge about caretaking expectations within her mentee's family.

Betsy's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution

Betsy's main aim was to establish a loving and supportive relationship with her mentee; therefore, her role in mentoring was to act as her mentee's surrogate aunt. She had spent countless hours playing the role of Aunt while taking care of her nieces and nephews. For Betsy, mentoring was a continuation of her ongoing efforts to learn how to nurture and care for children and a step toward a career that would provide her with abundant opportunities for caregiving.

Betsy seemed to follow distinct patterns when resolving dilemmas, which indicate her caregiving orientation to mentoring. She mentioned resolutions for dilemmas 59 times (see Table 4-7). Betsy's patterns of resolution included: (a) Finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do, (b) accepting responsibility, and (c) showing affection to the child.

Table 4-7
Betsy's Resolution Pattern Count

Finding a way to do what the mentee wants	39
Accepting responsibility	18
Showing affection to the child	2
Total	59

Resolution pattern 1: Finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do

The pattern of resolution that Betsy followed most frequently was to commit herself fully to finding a way to please her mentee. For Betsy, this meant spending time learning about her mentee's interests and considering these interests when planning activities and sessions. She mentioned finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do 35 times with dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach and four times with dilemmas of knowing about the mentee. Betsy learned that her mentee cherished her time spent at the learning center and spent as much time as she could there. Betsy's mentee also enjoyed developing a close, personal relationship with her mentors; this was also very important to Betsy, who said, "I was really hopeful that I'd have

someone (a mentee) who would love to talk to me and we would have a really great relationship, and so far it looks like we will" (P2I2 2/28).

As a result, both Betsy and her mentee looked forward to sessions with great anticipation. Field notes from observations confirm that Betsy frequently spent considerably more time at the learning center than she was required to do. In Betsy's second interview, she spoke of how she was increasing her time spent at the learning center. Betsy said, "I had my first session with her (the mentee) and we're already talking about going (to the learning center) 15 minutes early so we can spend more time at the site" (P2I2 1/31).

Most often, finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do meant that Betsy had to change her plans in order to be more responsive to her mentee; such changes in plans frequently lead to dilemmas for Betsy. Of the 44 times Betsy mentioned dilemmas of knowing how to teach, she described having tried the strategy of finding a way to do what her mentee wants 35 times. Betsy mentioned finding a way to do what the mentee wants another four times with dilemmas in the category of knowing about the mentee.

Betsy said of her responsive strategy for resolving dilemmas, "Well, I think I'm more focused on what (my mentee) wants. I will change almost anything I plan to do to something that she wants (to do)" (P2I5 7/54). Betsy used terms like "adjust" (P2I3 8/15) and "varying the content" (P2I3 6/21) to describe how she dealt with dilemmas such as Getting or maintaining the mentee's attention. Since Betsy wanted her sessions to focus on what appealed to her mentee,

Betsy was willing to defer to her mentee's wishes. Betsy described it this way:

> It's just in the way she responds to things . . . like, you have to adjust. I mean, it's not like I sit and think, "Oh, okay, this is important, let me think . . ." I mean, I think about it later . . . at the time, it's just "Okay she's not enjoying this . . . what can I do to change this? What can I do to make her excited about it again." Or, um, . . . turning things into lessons. (P2I3 8/15)

Betsy believed that this strategy was reasonable because everyday living requires flexibility. Betsy reinforced her beliefs about flexibility in resolving dilemmas when describing an example of the dilemma described as Plans backfiring:

> You can get really upset, and if you're really anal about it, you can say, "These are my plans, and we're going to stick to these plans!" But . . . or you could get really upset about it and you know, "I've got this really great idea, and we're not doing it." But, I mean, I just think it's life. You can't, . . . little ideas of how things are going to go is great. And you can plan things down to the last detail . . . I do that. But, it [mentoring sessions] rarely ever happens that way. And then something else comes along and you rework your plans, . . . you have to accept it with good grace otherwise you're going to spend a lot of time upset. (P2I4 4/26)

In Betsy's view, a good mentor plans, but will deviate from or "rework" a plan as necessary to meet the mentee's needs.

Resolution pattern 2: Accepting responsibility

Although Betsy encountered dilemmas frequently in mentoring, she rarely attributed the origins of her dilemmas to anything or anyone other than herself. Out of the 50 times Betsy mentioned dilemmas for this study, she mentioned her resolution strategy of accepting responsibility 18 times (see Table 4-7). Accepting responsibility for Betsy meant she held herself accountable for problem solving and that she

recognized how she could have an impact on all of the dilemmas she encountered. This strategy often worked in concert with her strategy of finding a way to meet the needs of the mentee; that is, Betsy often followed up her decision to accept responsibility for resolving a dilemma by trying to find a way to meet the mentee's needs. Betsy mentioned the resolution pattern of accepting responsibility with dilemmas in all three dilemma categories described in the previous section. The examples below reflect Betsy's strategy of accepting responsibility in the domain category with the greatest number of occurrences wherein she mentioned this strategy: the dilemma category of knowing how to teach.

Betsy mentioned the strategy of accepting responsibility 17 times when describing her dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach. In Betsy's view, being a good mentor meant that she needed to adjust not only her plans, but also her ways of thinking. Betsy expressed it this way:

> I'm getting to know [my mentee] more, it's like, "Okay, I know how she is going to respond to certain things, and I know she's not going to respond well to that . . . and this would be really good for her." So I think it's good that I've encountered how she thinks, so now it's changing the way I think. I think that's a good thing . . . then you decide, you know, if you're going to accept it or if you're going to like keep to your plans. I don't know, . . . so you have to start seeing things from other people's perspectives. Then you make your decision, you know, what you're going to do. (P2I4 5/19)

Clearly Betsy accepted that it was incumbent on her to accept the reponsibility for success in mentoring. Betsy's strategy of accepting responsibility required her to use different lenses when evaluating her work. She focused on understanding the mentee's perspectives in order to understand how best to design instructional activities.

Resolution pattern 3: Showing affection to the mentee

Betsy was concerned with establishing a close personal relationship with her mentee and spoke about that in her first interview before her field experience began. Betsy placed a high priority on her mentee's interest in establishing a friendship and was concerned that anything less would inhibit her as a mentor. Betsy said, "If the child doesn't like me, I'm like, 'Oh my God, what am I gonna do?' I'll take it very personally. Hopefully that won't happen" (P2I1 9/14). Betsy's wish came true as her mentee was as interested in forming a close bond as Betsy.

Betsy was openly affectionate with her mentee from their first meeting. She was thrilled when her mentee's first response upon meeting Besty was to give Betsy a hug. Betsy's focus on building and maintaining a close personal relationship extended to her approach to resolving dilemmas. Betsy mentioned the strategy of showing affection to the mentee twice as a way to resolve dilemmas (see Table 4-7). In a situation wherein Betsy's mentee came to the learning center visibly upset, Betsy chose to express her affection in a way that was sincere and respectful:

> I was like, "You know, whatever you tell me, I'm not going to be mad at you." She's like, "I know, . . . and I love you too. I just don't want to talk about it right now." I'm like, "Okay . . . that's fine." (P2I4 2/26)

Betsy could have ignored the dilemma and pushed forward with her plans or pressed her mentee for more information about whatever was so upsetting.

In the interview after Betsy described the dilemma above, she confirmed that her affectionate approach was intentional and consistent with her view of her role as a

mentor:

> I'm just there to make her feel better. You know, she feels as good as she can while she's with me and hopefully takes that out [with her after the session], but I can't fix her life or fix anything that might be wrong in it. (P2I5 6/9)

Betsy knew she could not presume to compare with her mentee's family, but she still assumed a role similar to a relative in that Betsy's affection toward her mentee was unconditional, or as she put it, "I just try to love her as much as possible and everything will go from there" (P2I5 8/20).

Summary

Betsy was a committed mentor who garnered much enjoyment from the experience and seemed undaunted by the myriad problems that arose during the field experience. Betsy mentioned pedagogical dilemmas most frequently, especially dilemmas of knowing how to generate and maintain interest and knowing how to teach subject matter. In particular, Betsy mentioned most often dilemmas of getting or maintaining the mentee's attention. She mentioned this dilemma 17 times in five interviews. The category of dilemmas related to knowing how to establish and maintain emotional connection contains Betsy's third largest clustering of dilemmas, wherein she mentioned having difficulty with the dilemma of knowing how to help the mentee with personal problems; she mentioned this dilemma five times.

Betsy chose strategies for resolving dilemmas that were permeated with caring and responsibility. Above all, Betsy was committed to establishing a close, personal relationship with her mentee. For Betsy, that meant it was up to her to make mentoring sessions enjoyable for her mentee. Hence, Betsy's resolution strategies for dilemmas included finding a

way to do what the mentee wants, accepting responsibility, and showing affection to the child. For Betsy, finding a way to do what the mentee wants meant being responsive and flexible with regard to how sessions were structured and what activities were engaged. Accepting responsibility was the resolution strategy that Betsy used when sessions or activities were not going as planned or her mentee was not enjoying herself. Showing affection to the child was Betsy's strategy when she perceived her mentee to be upset or unhappy, but especially when she could serve as a surrogate family member.

Comparison of Annie and Betsy: The Committed Mentors

Annie and Betsy have been described in this investigation as the committed mentors. During data analysis, Annie's and Betsy's commitment emerged as a theme in their resolution patterns; they were consistent in their quests to learn from the field experience and also to their mentees' academic improvement. Annie and Betsy consistently chose strategies that fit with these objectives. Annie and Betsy also maintained a positive attitude toward the field experience and saw mentoring as an opportunity to test their abilities to teach. Throughout the field experience, Annie and Betsy dedicated consistent or increased effort to planning and implementing mentoring sessions that were enriching or contributed to their mentees' academic improvement. The present discussion presents a summary of the similarities and differences between Annie and Betsy, especially their dilemmas, resolution patterns, approaches to mentoring, and the roles they chose to play in mentoring.

While Annie and Betsy were similar in the overall number of dilemmas they identified in the dilemma category of knowing how to teach, some distinct differences were evident. Annie identified nearly three times as many dilemmas as Betsy in the domain of knowing how or when to help the mentee with basic skills. The differences between Annie's and Betsy's mentees' academic abilities is one explanation for this disparity; Annie's mentee struggled to earn average or lower grades in school while Betsy's mentee was staffed in the gifted program, received better than average grades, and experienced only occasional difficulties in academics. Clearly, having mentees with such different academic capability influenced Annie's and Betsy's identification and choices of strategies to resolve dilemmas. Annie's and Betsy's mentees also had distinctly different attitudes toward school and dispositions toward learning academics, so these traits also were influential on Annie's and Betsy's dilemmas.

Annie differed from Betsy in the dilemma categories of knowing myself and knowing the mentee. Annie identified six dilemmas in the category of knowing myself, while Betsy did not mention this category. The differences between Annie and Betsy were also noteworthy in the category of knowing the mentee wherein Annie mentioned dilemmas of this type 11 times, in contrast to Betsy's only having mentioned only one dilemma in this category. The age difference between Annie (18 years old) and Betsy (20 years old) and Annie's having lived away from her family for a matter of weeks might account for differences in the category of knowing myself. Also, Annie's mentee was a reticent adolescent (only five

years younger than Annie), whereas Betsy's mentee was a very open, candid nine-year-old who was willing to share anything. Such differences in their mentees' personalities certainly had an impact on the types of dilemmas Annie and Betsy identified and which resolution strategies they chose.

Annie's and Betsy's resolution patterns differed in their responsiveness to dilemmas. Both Annie and Betsy viewed themselves as agents of change when mentoring sessions were not going well; however, Annie took action whenever she perceived that her mentee lacked knowledge or focus and persisted until the ensuing dilemma was resolved. Betsy's main focus of mentoring was to be responsive to her mentee; her most frequent responses to dilemmas were to find ways to change their sessions so that they were more interesting and enjoyable for her mentee. Betsy went to great lengths to adjust her sessions so that she could achieve these ends.

Differences in Annie's and Betsy's resolution patterns were apparent especially in their approaches to resolving dilemmas. For Annie, resolving dilemmas involved a very impersonal and efficient approach to problem solving. Annie gave answers or information, made vocabulary or information easier for her mentee, managed the focus, pace and topic of sessions, told her mentee what to do, and adjusted her plans when they were not working. Betsy's approach was more personal; she worked to find ways to make sessions reflective of her mentee's wishes, took sole responsibility when things did not go well, and regularly exchanged affectionate words and gestures with her mentee.

Similarities and differences in Annie's and Betsy's identification and resolution strategies for dilemmas

resulted from distinct choices as to their roles as mentors. Annie believed that her role in mentoring was to provide a much needed service to her mentee, which was to help her gain the knowledge she would need to be successful in school. Betsy also wanted to serve her mentee, but she targeted her mentee's affective needs and self-esteem. Annie was very careful to establish clear boundaries between the mentor's (teacher's) and the mentee's (student's) responsibilities; the two were distinct and seldom overlapped. Betsy frequently switched roles with her mentee, who she reinforced for being an expert at playing games, telling stories, or teaching Betsy about the neighborhood. Betsy was more concerned with nurturing than teaching and made her mentee's feelings a higher priority than academics. While Annie gave some consideration to her mentee's feelings about their mentoring sessions, affective concerns were of less importance than making academic progress.

In Chapter 5, cases are presented for Cindy and Dawn, the mentors who contrast with Annie and Betsy because of their lack of or inconsistent levels of commitment. As in the cases presented in this chapter, Cindy's and Dawn's cases include biographical information, descriptions of their mentoring sessions, detailed presentation of their dilemmas, roles in mentoring and resolutions.

CHAPTER 5
CINDY AND DAWN

This investigation focused on how four preservice teachers experienced dilemmas working as mentors with African American children and youth in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. Four case studies were constructed that illustrates how mentors identified and resolved dilemmas in this early field experience. Two guiding questions drove the study:

1. What dilemmas do white, female mentors identify as they work with African American children in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program?
2. How do mentors resolve dilemmas?

The investigator conducted ethnographic interviews and field observations several times throughout the field experience which was ten weeks in length during one semester. Formal interviews were based in part on a predetermined set of questions (see Appendix); however, a conversational format was maintained to encourage the participants to speak freely. Spontaneous questions were asked during interviews to prompt participants when elaboration was needed as the investigator sought to understand the participants' perspectives about dilemmas and resolutions.

Cindy and Dawn were observed nine times during the semester at the learning centers to which they were assigned, or half of each participant's mentoring sessions. The

investigator sat in a central location in the learning center and was able to see most of Cindy's and Dawn's activities during mentoring sessions, though it was difficult at times to hear when they spoke softly.

Written artifacts produced by the participants in their course work were collected for analysis. Artifacts included papers and journal entries written for their teacher education courses. Written artifacts were used for verifying the investigator's interpretations and corraborating evidence from interview and observation data. Such data was compared with data in domains during data analysis.

The following case studies reflect Cindy's and Dawn's stories of how they experienced dilemmas in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

Organization of the Chapter

In Chapter 5, case studies are presented that describe the two participants who demonstrated a lack of commitment to mentoring. That is, Cindy and Dawn were inconsistently dedicated with regard to the time and energy they expended to helping their mentee's become more successful in school. Biographical descriptions of Cindy and Dawn are included that present information about their families, homelives, schooling background, relevant experiences working with children, and their entering perspectives about the Bright Futures field experience. These biographies provide a foundation upon which to build understandings of how the participants identified and resolved mentoring dilemmas. The cases also include overviews of Cindy's and Dawn's mentoring sessions, descriptions of their dilemmas, and patterns of resolution (Berlak & Berlak, 1981) for dilemmas.

The four participants in this study mentioned 21 distinct dilemmas that fell into four domains (see Tables 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5). In the cases that follow, examples are presented of the dilemmas Cindy and Dawn mentioned most often of the four main categories of domains. Examples appear first of their dilemmas in the subcategories of the largest dilemma category, knowing how to teach, then from the remaining three dilemma categories of knowing myself, knowing the mentee, and knowing the people in the neighborhood. The examples chosen are both vivid and illustrative of the investigator's interpretations of each participant's orientation to mentoring.

Cindy's and Dawn's unique stories of how they experienced mentoring dilemmas surface as the frequencies of their encounters with dilemmas are combined with their patterns of resolution. Within the patterns of resolution lies information about their aims for mentoring since patterns of resolution are directly related to their aims and the roles they assumed.

Overview of Kinds of Dilemmas

Of the 247 instances in which the participants made direct or indirect references to dilemmas in mentoring (see Table 4-1), Cindy mentioned dilemmas 93 times, and Dawn 43 times. Combined, their references to dilemmas account for 55 percent of the total number of instances where the participants in the study mentioned dilemmas. Cindy and Dawn mentioned dilemmas in all of the four domain categories of knowing how to teach, knowing myself, knowing the mentee, and knowing the people in the neighborhood. The examples

presented in the cases below are from subcategories containing specific mentoring dilemmas.

All four participants mentioned dilemmas from the category of knowing how to teach, which contains three main subcategories of knowing how to teach subject matter, knowing how to generate and maintain interest, and knowing how to establish and maintain an emotional connection. Cindy and Dawn mentioned dilemmas that were categorized as dilemmas of knowing how to teach, but were not mentioned by Annie or Betsy. Dawn experienced a dilemma that, for her, makes up a fifth subcategory called dealing with unsatisfactory conditions or support. Cindy mentioned a dilemma that forms a fourth subcategory representing dilemmas of knowing how to communicate effectively. For Cindy, this subcategory influences all other subcategories in the category of knowing how to teach, but is not contained within the four main subcategories (see Table 4-2).

Cindy and Dawn mentioned the category of knowing myself 32 times. This category includes three dilemmas related to their inability to manage emotional situations and personal knowledge deficits. It also includes dilemmas caused by their inability to articulate their thinking and learning processes. The specific dilemmas in this category are Being prepared to deal with my emotions, knowing about my own lack of knowledge, and knowing about my own thinking and learning. Cindy's and Dawn's number of dilemmas of knowing myself accounted for 84 percent of the total number in this category for the study (see Table 4-1).

The category of knowing the mentee was mentioned 15 times by Cindy and once by Dawn, or 57 percent of the total

for this category for all four participants. This category includes four dilemmas: (a) Mentee lacks knowledge, skills, abilities, or aptitude; (b) Mentee demonstrates learned helplessness; (c) Mentee demonstrates resistance; and (d) Mentee demonstrates avoidance behavior. The total number of this category of dilemmas mentioned by all four participants was 28 (see Table 4-1), or 11 percent of the total number of dilemmas described for this study.

Cindy mentioned the domain category of knowing the people in the neighborhood five times, and Dawn mentioned it once. This category includes the dilemmas of knowing the mentee's family and knowing the residents. Together, Cindy's and Dawn's dilemmas in this category account for 75 percent of the total number of dilemmas in this category for the study (see Table 4-5).

Overview of Participants' Resolutions and Roles

Cindy's and Dawn's patterns of resolution were related to the roles they played as mentors. In each one of the cases described below, the roles of the participants provide contexts for the descriptions of their efforts to identify and resolve dilemmas, which was noted by the Berlaks' (1981) in their study--a teacher's socialization affects her patterns of resolution and which dilemmas are priorities and which are resolvable. The cases provide a view of Cindy and Dawn that offers insights into how each dealt with the aspects of mentoring that they found problematic. Such insights may be useful for teacher educators who focus on the preparation of effective teachers of diverse learners.

In this chapter, two case studies are presented that describe the participants who demonstrated a low level of

commitment to mentoring. Cindy and Dawn were consistently unwilling or unable to dedicate time and energy to helping their mentee's learn. As in Chapter 4, the cases that follow contain biographical descriptions, overviews of the participants' mentoring sessions, descriptions of their dilemmas, and patterns of resolution for dilemmas.

Participant Number 3 (P3): Cindy

Cindy was 20 years old when she began her first semester in the College of Education. Her hometown is a small coastal city in northeast Florida. She moved to Florida from New Mexico when she was in middle school. Cindy described where her family resided as a middle class beach community; she lived there with her parents who have no other children.

Cindy recalled very little about her school background. She remembered facts about the demographics of her schools and a few extraordinary events, but relatively little else. Cindy recalled attending public school in New Mexico, but her comments were limited to her memories about the high ratio of white students versus African Americans. When asked to compare schools in New Mexico with schools in northeast Florida, Cindy claims to having had no knowledge of racial tensions in New Mexico that could compare with the problems she observed in Florida schools. Cindy saw signs of racial tension between white and black students in Florida but believed they were wrong to view one another as adversaries. As evidence, Cindy recounted that while she was in New Mexico, her best friend was African American; however, she acknowledged that most of her friends were white in the parochial school she attended when her family moved to Florida. Cindy reported feeling amazed that white and black

students separated themselves in her high school, where several crimes occurred that drew negative media attention and damaged the reputation of her school.

Cindy was beginning her third year at the university when she was accepted into the elementary education program. Prior to her first semester in the College of Education, Cindy had difficulty deciding on a major. Some prompting by her father led her to choose elementary education, in part because Cindy had a keen interest in teaching reading; she planned on becoming a reading specialist. Cindy also said, "I like kids a lot" (P3I1 5/4) when explaining her rationale for majoring in elementary education.

Cindy's experience with children included babysitting prior to leaving for college. She also spent time as a volunteer working with the children at a shelter for abused women. Her duties as a volunteer included reading to and playing with the children. Occasionally, Cindy went on field trips with the children. The purpose of the activities Cindy undertook was to provide the mothers with a respite from their children while they were visiting the shelter.

While she was participating in the Bright Futures field experience, Cindy worked as a retail salesperson in a local mall. Cindy spent her leisure time with friends and roommates, with whom she would often talk about mentoring.

When asked how she felt about participating in Bright Futures, Cindy said, "I am a little nervous about it" (P3I1 6/17). She said she had not heard about Bright Futures before her first semester in the College of Education, though she recalled signing up to participate in the project during registration. Cindy also remembered hearing rumors about the

neighborhoods where mentoring took place, but she claimed not to have believed them; she doubted that the College of Education would send students into danger. Prior to beginning the field experience, Cindy was worried about the perceptions of the children who participated in Bright Futures; she wondered if the children perceived that the mentors were there to do "charity work."

Cindy expected to work with her mentee on academics and that mentoring was "my breaking-in on learning how to work with kids as far as teaching them things" (P3I1 6/12). She explained her perception of the expectations of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program:

> From what they've [Bright Futures representatives] told us, . . . basically what I'm getting from it, we're supposed to go and we're just supposed to pretty much kind of hang out with the kid. But, you're supposed to have these planned activities and [they] want you to, like, lean toward making them so that it's a learning thing. I don't know how well that's going to work with him. Plus, he's only in first grade, so a lot of it is like playing. (P3I2 3/5)

Cindy also thought she would spend time helping her mentee with homework, though she was apprehensive because she had no experience in that capacity. Cindy summed up her ideas about why she was in Bright Futures saying, "I just hope that I can do a good job at this. I mean, I feel like this is kinda the first step in going toward the classroom. I want to like it" (P3I1 6/20).

Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach

From her first meeting with her mentee, Cindy had doubts about her ability to be an effective mentor. Cindy learned that her mentee was six years old, in the second grade (though she seemed unsure of this), and "full of energy . . .

he ran around the whole time" (P3I2 1/30). Cindy described how her mentee was struggling with basic skills in literacy and mathematics:

> He [Cindy's mentee] guesses and sometimes it doesn't seem like he knows the logical order of numbers or even the alphabet because he practiced writing the alphabet on some lined paper and a couple of letters. He was like, he had to stop and think, "What comes next?" Well, he's in second grade and I'm thinking, "Oh no, he's not really completely comfortable with the order of the alphabet" so it's hard. It's seems like he doesn't really see things like that. (P3I5 2/51)

Cindy quickly learned that her mentee preferred playing games outdoors and climbing trees to anything school-like, with the exception of playing computer games in the learning center.

Because of her mentee's active disposition, Cindy figured that getting her mentee to sit inside the center and focus solely on academic activities would be impossible. Given this information, perhaps it is not surprising that Cindy spoke of dilemmas of knowing how to teach more often than the other three participants in this study; Cindy mentioned dilemmas in this category 53 times in seven interviews. Additionally, Cindy's dilemmas appear in more domains than any of the other participants (see Table 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, 4-5), which means Cindy talked about her experiences with dilemmas more than the other three participants.

Knowing how to help the mentee with basic skills

During her second meeting with her mentee, Cindy discovered that he was struggling with basic academic skills. Cindy also realized that she did not know how to help her mentee learn academic skills. She mentioned this dilemma eight times in five interviews. In her efforts to get to know her mentee and to assess his academic aptitude, Cindy

tried several techniques including playing games that would give her some indication of her mentee's abilities. She described how she used a deck of playing cards to assess his mathematics skills:

> I had my cards out and I was like, "Well, you have six red ones, well, which one of these is the number six card?" So he [the mentee] would pick out which one, and he was a little shaky on that, like he's still not identifying his numbers real well. He counted real well, he did that, and he, like, he did a little bit, like, adding it together, but he's still not, like, he gets mixed up on his numbers, like what they look like. (P3I3 2/24)

Cindy discovered that her mentee's literacy skills were weak and that he strenuously avoided working on reading and spelling:

> Just like, . . . yesterday I tried to get him to just read his spelling words to me and he just didn't want to do that [laughs]. He wouldn't even, like I would point and he wouldn't even look at the words . . . going, "No . . . I don't know." (P3I3 2/3)

Cindy encountered a dilemma that arose from her beliefs about her mentee's lack of even the most basic skills that she included in her activities:

> Maybe he slipped through the cracks in kindergarten? I would assume they taught him the alphabet in kindergarten. I would hope so, but it seems like it was, "Oh yeah, the teacher taught that. I wasn't really paying attention." That's the kind of idea I get, and I don't know, I think somebody, you know, if he can't stand up by the end of kindergarten and just spout out the alphabet, there may be a problem. But I don't really, you know, short of going back and really insulting his intelligence saying, "Okay, today we're going to learn the alphabet." I try to let him get it on his own. He works it out. It just takes longer than I think most kids his age would take to say, "Okay, what comes after 'm'?" It takes him a minute to think about it. What comes after 12? He doesn't really understand that 12 + 1 is whatever is next. So, therefore, I can't explain that 12 + 2 is 2 down the line from 12, so . . . it's kind of hard. (P3I5 2/63)

Cindy's dilemma surfaced when she could not reconcile her mentee's low aptitude and her lack of knowledge about how to teach basic skills. For Cindy, helping her mentee with academics was simply not within her capabilities. She was constantly stymied by her mentee's lack of skills and encountered this dilemma throughout her field experience.

Getting and maintaining the mentee's attention

Cindy's mentee's first act in mentoring was to ask Cindy to watch him climb a nearby tree. Cindy's requests and pleas had to be repeated several times before she could get her mentee to go into the learning center. Once inside, Cindy's mentee often continued his high energy approach to anything he did. This caused an ongoing struggle between Cindy and her mentee, which Cindy mentioned 10 times in five interviews. Cindy believed that the best she could expect was that her mentee would sit and work inside the learning center for half of each of her one hour sessions. Cindy related how she thought about this issue:

> I was thinking we [Cindy and her mentee] really have to do half-and-half; like, "Will you do this with me right now and then we'll go and play Hide-N-Seek for the rest of the time" because he does not want to sit still. (P3I2 1/41)

Cindy's dilemma arose from her desire to meet her perceived responsibility as a mentor, which was to help her mentee with things that would improve his performance in school. In Cindy's view, simply playing was not going to help her mentee. She described her dilemma this way:

> I've got to figure out a way to get him [her mentee] to sit still for a while, and that's why I thought about, like, maybe we'd try the half and half and, like, I could get him to sit down with me for half of the time and, like, work on something and then we'll go play and do whatever he wants for the rest of the time, . . . the

> other half hour. I was also trying to decide maybe there's some way that I could make Hide-N-Seek educational. (P3I2 3/29)

Cindy's dilemma involved her struggle to find a way to help her mentee feel motivated enough to pay attention to the activities she planned. She faced the dilemma of having to design activities that could compete with her mentee's favorite pastime: Hide-N-Seek. At stake were Cindy's feelings of efficacy as a mentor who was responsible for meeting the requirements of her teacher education program. At the same time, Cindy recognized that her relationship with her mentee was also at stake. Cindy's mentee disliked school-like activities and was not likely to focus his attention on such things. Therefore, when facing the opposing expectations of her teacher education program and her mentee, Cindy's outlook was tentative at best.

Cindy struggled with communication throughout her field experience in Bright Futures. Her difficulties with communication had an impact on all of her work as a mentor, hence the inclusion of knowing how to communicate effectively as an overarching subcategory of dilemmas. Additionally, Cindy was the only participant in this study who mentioned the dilemma of knowing how to communicate effectively; she mentioned it six times in three interviews.

One aspect of this dilemma was Cindy's difficulty expressing herself to her mentee. Cindy attributed her difficulties with communication to having been an "only child." Cindy said, "I was so shy when I was little, and I'm still bad. I'm just getting good about making eye contact with people" (P3I7 16/23). Cindy described her mentoring dilemma of knowing how to communicate effectively:

> I noticed I'm getting bad, . . . if I don't look at him [Cindy's mentee] now when I talk to him, . . . because he doesn't look at me, . . . I should learn to be a little bit better at looking at him when I'm talking to him. (P3I7 17/1)

When combined with the mentee's hesitance to converse, Cindy's communication dilemma was twofold; both Cindy and her mentee tended to rely on others to initiate conversation. While Cindy considered her mentee to be partly to blame for her difficulties, she acknowledged hesitantly that her own tendency toward reticence caused this dilemma. She said, "I'm kind of bad about that [making eye contact] sometimes and wondered if maybe it wasn't necessarily him that wasn't looking at me. It was that I wasn't looking at him enough" (P3I8 11/6). Cindy's dilemma included problems with oral communication; Cindy said, "I know I'm bad about saying exactly how I feel . . . But, I mean, I always act like I give off enough signs so that people know" (P3I4 9/28).

Data from fieldnotes includes references to an absence of eye contact between Cindy and her mentee. In early observations, Cindy's mentee made frequent, but brief eye contact when asking questions. At the beginning of the field experience, Cindy's mentee talked constantly while he worked, sometimes even pretending to talk to the materials he was working with. By the fifth week of Cindy's field experience, her mentee seldom made eye contact with Cindy while they worked together and had ceased his monologue.

By week six of the field experience, Cindy and her mentee were not getting along at all. Cindy said, "The last two sessions have not been good at all. He just hasn't . . . he's not talking to me as much anymore! I don't know why. He just doesn't really say that much" (P3I6 1/4). Cindy said

that she felt "awful" and perplexed by the worsening condition of her relationship with her mentee, which she measured in terms of the amount of talking during their sessions. Despite having accepted her own problems with communication, Cindy denied responsibility for her dilemma. She said, "I really have no idea why it's getting like this" (P3I6 1/27).

Getting the mentee to talk

The second aspect of Cindy's dilemmas of knowing how to communicate effectively was derived from Cindy's difficulties getting the mentee to talk to her. When her mentoring field experience began, Cindy remarked that her mentee "talks pretty much the whole time" (P3I3 1/19). By the fourth week of her field experience, Cindy noted that her mentee was less talkative. The next week, Cindy complained that her mentee had very little to say at all. She explained, "If I ask a question, there doesn't seem to be an answer. I mean, maybe, like, he doesn't want to say anything or, like, he'll say what he thinks I want to hear" (P3I5 3/136). Cindy resorted to blaming the mentee when there was not much conversation during mentoring sessions. Cindy described her perceptions of the dilemma related to her mentee's reticence as "really hard for him. He won't just expand on a simple question. You really have to kind of nitpick about each and every little detail to get any information" (P3I5 4/159). Cindy considered her mentee's lack of things to say to be due to his personality. Cindy said:

> It might just be in his personality; he's not a talker. I know some of the kids, if you ask them a question, they just talk and talk, so maybe he's just kind of has been taught to keep quiet of he's just not a very verbal person. (P3I5 7/307)

Cindy's expectations of her mentee did not match her expectations about second graders. Cindy's dilemma surfaced because she found it unacceptable that her mentee would wait for her to initiate conversation. Ironically, Cindy spoke freely about her own tendency to be shy and reserved in social situations.

Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: Mentee Demonstrating Learned Helplessness

Cindy's mentee was well-versed in strategies for diverting Cindy's efforts to get him focused on academic skills. He would offer excuses like "I can't" and "I don't know how" when facing activities that required reading and mathematics. Her mentee's tendency to offer such excuses posed a particularly difficult dilemma for Cindy as she believed that it was very important that she infuse academics into mentoring activities.

While Cindy knew that her mentee was not interested in participating in school-like exercises, she tried explicitly and covertly to get her mentee to practice basic reading and mathematics skills. Cindy tried bargaining with her mentee for some time to work on academics by proposing a trade; Cindy would play games with her mentee if he would spend time working on mathematics or reading skills. Cindy also tried embedding practice in basic reading and mathematics within activities like baking cookies or playing computer games. Both approaches to getting her mentee to work on basic academic skills yielded little success. Cindy described how her attempt failed to get her mentee to spell while working on a computer game:

> Yesterday when we were trying to spell dragon. I was doing the sounds and he couldn't . . . he wouldn't even

> say what letter it was. It was just like, "I dunno." And he always goes, "I don't know, I don't know how to write dragon." He says that a lot. When I'll ask him, "Well, how do you think you spell this?" or , "What do you think the first letter is?" [He says,) "I dunno. I don't know how to spell this." (P3I6 6/4)

Along with his excuses, Cindy also noted that her mentee's attitude changed when he was asked to try to spell:

> He just gets real impatient, he doesn't want to, like, take the time. Like, I was trying to get him to spell 'em [the mentee's spelling words] with me and sound it out, but he just gets really impatient. [Cindy's mentee says,] "I don't know . . . I don't know how to do that . . ." [using a sarcastic tone and facial expression]. (P3I8 1/33)

While describing this situation, Cindy changed the way she spoke when recounting the words of her mentee. In a sarcastic manner, Cindy would begin to imitate her mentee and use a whining tone that was exaggerated. Cindy did an imitation of her mentee when relating this example of her mentee demonstrating learned helplessness:

> Yesterday when we were standing up there, I was, like, "Why don't you explain to them what some of these pictures are?" He's like, "I don't know how to read . . ." [imitating her mentee] I was like, "I'm not asking you to read anything." He always says he doesn't know. (P3I8 2/10)

Cindy's mentee was very adept at using his strategies for diverting Cindy's plans. Cindy was not prepared to deal with her mentee's excuses and negative attitude. She did she want to force him to try to learn the skills he lacked. The combination of these factors resulted in a dilemma that left Cindy perplexed and disheartened.

Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Dealing with Emotions

Participating in the Bright Futures field experience was emotionally difficult for Cindy. She spoke frequently about

her frustration, about her ability as a mentor, about her mentee's lack of skills, and her doubts about her effectiveness; Cindy mentioned feeling stress, anger, doubt, or frustration 20 times in four interviews. Cindy described her most trying dilemma of knowing myself which occurred after a session when Cindy was taking her mentee home in her car:

> It was just one of those days when we hadn't had a very good session and then he [the mentee] got in the car with me and said, "Can I have that, can I have this, can I have this, can I have this?" and I was, it . . . it got on my nerves a little bit . . . He's always, like, can I have this, can I have that. The other day he was doing it and it was annoying me because he asked me for, like, four things in a row. (P3I7 9/11)

Cindy's dilemma stemmed from her feelings of frustration and displeasure when she confronted unexpected behavior from her mentee. Cindy was annoyed by what she considered rude behavior and was frustrated when she did not know how to deal with her mentee's requests for things. Cindy related how she recognized her dilemma:

> He'd [the mentee] been asking me for things kind of a lot lately . . . and then I felt, like, I felt annoyed. And then I realized, like, I shouldn't be feeling like this, or I don't want to feel like this, so then you know this is probably . . . that this is a problem. Something needs to be changed or fixed. (P3I8 7/1)

Cindy knew that her reaction had been inappropriate when her mentee asked her for things and that is was up to her to change her response:

> It kind of depends on your moods, I think. Like, after he [Cindy's mentee] did that and I let him off, I hadn't had a good session, and then he irritated me in the car and so I just went home and I didn't worry about it for a little while. If you're just all annoyed by it right away, I don't really think things through very well when I'm like that. (P3I7 11/1)

Cindy recognized that her dilemma resulted from her inability to respond at the time when she was with her mentee and that her reaction was influenced by a series of negative circumstances. Cindy did not probe further for the cause of this dilemma; rather, she seemed satisfied to claim that she was inexperienced at dealing with children whose upbringings were different from her own.

Cindy's Dilemmas of Knowing About the People in the Neighborhood: Knowing the Residents

Cindy felt like an outsider when she visited the neighborhood where her mentee lived. She had little knowledge about the people who lived around the learning center, nor did she know how to go about becoming more well-informed about the neighborhood residents. Not knowing about the residents was a dilemma for Cindy because she encountered many people outside the learning center while she and her mentee played outdoors and took walks. Cindy did not know what the residents thought of her and that made Cindy uncomfortable. Cindy mentioned the dilemma of knowing the residents four times in three interviews. Cindy's description of the way residents looked at her during her first visit to the learning center provides insights into her considering the residents' view of her as a stranger:

> I felt a little out of place when we walked down to his [Cindy's mentee's] house, just because, . . . well, people stare. They really do. There's a lot of people just like, standing on their porches and just, kind of watching you and wondering what you're doing, . . . but it was a little strange. (P3I2 2/28)

Cindy did not consider herself prejudiced, but she knew that she was not well informed enough to avoid feeling uncomfortable around her mentee and other residents:

> I feel like I don't have any problem with anyone else's beliefs. I really don't have any prejudice against that. I do feel like I don't really know a lot. Like, we were talking about . . . one of my teachers was talking about how, like, sometimes you'll just stick your foot in your mouth and you'll say something that is just completely against some kid's beliefs and you won't even realize you're doing it. Like, just if you're talking about a holiday or something. So I feel like, yeah, I kinda do need to know that stuff because then it's a little bit easier to be respectful and not step on anyone's toes. But I think, I feel like I already have respect for other people but I'm just not very informed on other cultures. (P3I7 7/29)

Cindy lacked knowledge about neigborhood residents and strategies for gathering the knowledge she needed. Cindy's lack of knowledge was a liability that could interfere with her ability to establish a close relationship with her mentee as well as plan and implement activities.

Cindy's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution

Cindy's main aim in mentoring was to conduct sessions that were fun for her mentee and supplemented his school learning. For Cindy, being a good mentor meant following the lead of her mentee's classroom teacher. Cindy saw mentoring as a less formal and more loosely structured extension of the regular school day. In order for her to be successful as a mentor, her mentee needed to come to their sessions with the basic skills that Cindy believed all students her mentee's age possessed. That way, Cindy could help her mentee raise his level of achievement and be more successful in school. As described in the biographical sketch of Cindy, above, she had no siblings or children in her immediate family, and though she had spent time working with children, the conditions under which she served constrained the role she played. For example, as a volunteer working with the children at a shelter for abused women, Cindy's role was to

play with the children and take them on outings and field trips, but she was not allowed to act as a tutor or teacher. Analysis of Cindy's strategies for resolving dilemmas in mentoring yielded the patterns of (a) knowing your limits, (b) searching for the correct procedure, and (c) getting the mentee engaged. Cindy mentioned resolutions to dilemmas 91 times (see Table 5-1).

Table 5-1
Cindy's Resolution Pattern Counts

Knowing your limits	27
Searching for the correct procedure	30
Getting the mentee engaged	34
Total	91

Resolution Pattern 1: Know Your Limits

Cindy seemed to adopt an approach to mentoring that was similar to her previous experience working with children as a volunteer. In all of her volunteering capacities, Cindy was given tasks to complete by an authority figure, such as a program director or classroom teacher. She seemed to view mentoring as a tightly constrained job requiring her to play the role of a helper rather than trying to be like a teacher.

Cindy's mentee could not do basic reading, writing, and mathematics. Cindy did not believe she was capable of providing the assistance her mentee needed, so she tended to defer to her mentee's classroom teacher when she encountered

dilemmas originating with her mentee's lack of skills. As a result, she elected not to take on all of the challenges she faced. Cindy explained:

> I kinda feel like there's only so much you can do in mentoring. And she [the director of Bright Futures] even told us . . . she's like, "I don't expect you to make these kids good readers or whatever . . ." But I feel like this is a pretty big problem, and if he [her mentee] really can't do any of this, then I hope his teacher's doing something about it at school. I dunno. I thought about maybe calling her, 'cause we got their sheets and she left her number. I was just going to ask her, like, maybe ask her exactly what he should be able to read right now. Like, what are they reading in their classes and stuff. 'Cause he won't bring his bookbag; I tried. (P3I6 6/13)

In response to her mentee's resistance, Cindy chose a passive approach. She made her provision of assistance dependent upon her mentee bringing materials. Cindy believed that she was prepared only to help her mentee work on things the classroom teacher was already working on in school.

Cindy seemed to be protecting herself from what must have appeared to be overwhelming adversity; her mentee could barely read, write and do mathematics and Cindy was ill-prepared to remediate him. In addition, Cindy's perception was that the aim of helping her mentee become more successful in school was an ominous obstacles. In order to survive the field experience and maintain a manageable level of stress, Cindy chose to limit her efforts and investment of time and energy.

Cindy's choice to limit her role was evident following the episode Cindy described when her mentee asked for things during a short ride in Cindy's car. Cindy related feeling "annoyed" (P3I8 7/2) as her mentee pointed to things and asked if he could have them. Afterward, Cindy decided that,

"something needs to be changed or fixed" (P3I8 7/4). She rationalized her mentee's behavior as being reflective of his upbringing as the youngest child in a large family.

Cindy chose to use a response to her mentee's requests that placed a demand on him, where previously it was Cindy who faced such demands. Cindy said, "But now, every time, . . . he still asks me for stuff, and so whenever he asks I always say, 'Well, what'cha going to give me?' And then he looks real confused and then he doesn't say anything else" (P3I8 7/1). Cindy's limiting strategy works toward two ends; asking the uncomfortable question of her mentee deferred the uncertainty over what strategy would get her mentee to discontinue his requests, and limiting her reaction helped Cindy maintain clear boundaries in her relationship with her mentee. Cindy felt successful with regard to this resolution strategy because it required no confrontation as well as minimal investment of energy and time.

Cindy chose the strategy of knowing your limits frequently. She mentioned it 19 times when describing dilemmas in the category of knowing myself, four times with dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach, 12 times with the category of knowing about the mentee, and two times with the category of knowing the residents.

Resolution Pattern 2: Search for the Right Procedure

Implicit in Cindy's approach to resolving dilemmas was her idea that there was a "best way" to do things. In Cindy's view, success in mentoring was a matter of finding the right procedures. Cindy mentioned the resolution of Search for the right procedure 30 times (see Table 5-1). In the dilemma category of knowing how to teach, Cindy described

her approach to resolving the dilemma of getting and maintaining the mentee's attention:

> I guess I'm just kind of making a mental folder for him [Cindy's mentee] . . . of the things that he likes to do, or that interest him . . . so that . . . just 'cause, I'm not sure about my activities right now, like, I'm just kind of like . . . I went to the Bright Futures handbook and I read over that stuff and that kind of gave me a few ideas. But I'm just kind of . . . right now I'm just kind of trying out stuff on him. (P3I3 9/26)

Cindy's feelings of uncertainty prompted her to look for resources that might contain ideas for activities that would interest her mentee and sustain his attention. Cindy echoes this theme in her description of an attempt at a resolution to a dilemma related to her mentee's lack of knowledge, skills, abilities, or aptitude:

> I've seen his [her mentee's] spelling list so they're spelling, like, basic words like cat and mat and stuff like that. So I'm figuring he should be able to do those or something close to that. I thought maybe the beads would be a good way to concentrate on that. (P3I4 1/22)

To Cindy, the answers she seeks are available, yet elusive. She considers that her role involves a sort of detective work that will yield the procedure that will not only be interesting enough to engage her mentee, but will also help him academically.

Resolution Pattern 3: Getting the Mentee Engaged

Cindy's most common strategy for resolving dilemmas was to find a way to get her mentee to spend time seated, quiet, and working in a focused manner. She mentioned trying to resolve dilemmas in this fashion 34 times (see Table 5-1). Of Cindy's attempts to resolve dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach, getting and maintaining her mentee's

attention was of great concern to Cindy; she mentioned working to resolve this dilemma of knowing how to teach six times. Cindy described her strategy to get her mentee engaged this way:

> I was thinking we really have to do half and half . . . like, "Will you do this with me right now and then we'll go and play Hide-and-Seek for the rest of the time?" Because he does not want to sit still. (P3I2 1/41)

Cindy resorted to negotiating a trade with her mentee. In return for spending half of their session outside, Cindy's mentee would agree to sit inside and participate in the activities she had planned. Cindy went on to say that she recognized that she could not expect her mentee to find intrinsic interest in academically oriented lessons "Because he did not seem interested at all in school. So getting him to sit down . . . I know I'm going to have to make it fun so he's going to like it" (P3I2 3/46). Cindy continued her search for ways to get her mentee engaged, though she and her mentee gradually spent less time on academics each week for the remainder of her field experience. As the frequency increased of Cindy abandoning her plans, the frequency with which she resorted to this pattern of resolution for dilemmas.

Summary

Cindy showed sporadic committment to mentoring that diminished throughout the field experience. The dilemmas Cindy mentioned most frequently were knowing how to generate and maintain interest and knowing how to teach subject matter. In particular, Cindy mentioned most often dilemmas of getting or maintaining the mentee's attention. She mentioned this dilemma 17 times, nearly three times as often

as her next most frequently mentioned dilemma of knowing how to assess the mentee's competence. Cindy mentioned dilemmas in the category of dilemmas related to knowing how to teach subject matter 19 times.

Cindy's attempts to resolve dilemmas reflect her desire to establish limits for herself and her mentee. She mentioned her strategy of knowing your limits 28 times. Cindy lacked confidence in her ability to manage her mentee's behavior, plan activities that would engage her mentee, and produce evidence that she could teach; Cindy rarely chose to take risks in planning or implementing activities. For example, when Cindy discovered that her mentee was very active and did not enjoy sitting and working quietly, she summarily ruled out the possibility of conducting activities with an academic focus. Cindy also chose to design activities that were short in duration, as she did not expect her mentee could sustain his attention on such things. Therefore, Cindy's resolution strategy of getting the mentee engaged was frequently her response to her mentee's active nature.

Cindy also believed that teaching her mentee required Searching for the correct procedure; she mentioned this resolution strategy 28 times. In Cindy's view, implementing the right procedure would result in her mentee's being able to complete an activity and demonstrate that he had learned what Cindy taught. Consequently, Cindy's approach to preparing for mentoring sessions entailed selecting ideas for activities from the mentoring handbook, from books of practical ideas for teachers provided by one of her

instructors, or borrowing ideas and materials from another mentor.

From the outset of the field experience, Cindy felt unprepared for her mentee's avoidance behaviors which interfered with many of her activities. When her mentee was resistant, Cindy did whatever she could to get her mentee engaged. For Cindy, it was of the utmost importance to keep her mentee occupied even if it meant abandoning her plans. As the field experience progressed, Cindy mentioned this strategy with increasing frequency. As it became more common for Cindy to deviate from her plans, she began to attribute these occurrences to her mentee's inability to focus and her inability to find or select effective procedures. When she did not find the right procedures, Cindy gradually invested less time and energy to mentoring.

Participant Number 4 (P4):Dawn

Dawn was born and raised in a large metropolitan city on the southwest coast of Florida. Dawn is the second youngest of five children of divorced parents; she lived with her mother from the time Dawn was in seventh grade. Dawn's father is a captain in the local police department who sees his children on weekends and holidays. Dawn's mother was a housewife until her divorce, then she founded two schools for teaching swimming that serve up to 700 children in the summer. According to Dawn, her mother was strict, but did not use physical punishment; Dawn speaks well of her mother and their relationship. She is also close with her siblings, especially her younger sister. Dawn was 23 years old at the time of the present study.

Dawn describes herself as a middle-class person from a middle-class upbringing. Though her family experienced financial difficulty after her parents' divorce, Dawn said she was unaware of it. Her home is in a subdivision populated by white people and a neighborhood that Dawn considered to be a "neat place to grow up" (P4I1 2/17).

Dawn attended a nearby public elementary school of mostly white students. When she started middle school, Dawn was bused to an urban school near public housing projects populated by African Americans; Dawn was one of a small percentage of white students at that school. Dawn remembers frequent bomb threats, guns, and violence punctuating her middle school experience. She related particularly vivid memories of an African American girl who assumed a role as Dawn's protector and mentor; through her protector's teachings, Dawn learned to stand up for herself and defend herself against her antagonists, whom Dawn recalls were plentiful. Dawn's mother decided to take advantage of a magnet program for students who wished to go into farming and agriculture and sent Dawn to an all white high school. In high school, Dawn had many friends from a variety of backgrounds and was satisfied with her academic program.

Dawn started college while still living at home and attended a local community college. She spent three years taking courses and trying different major programs but dropped out on two occasions. Her work at her mother's swim schools helped Dawn decide to become a serious and committed student. After touring the United States and Australia, Dawn realized that her aspirations for succeeding as a professional swimming teacher could not be reached without a

college degree. As a result of this realization, Dawn becamed determined and commited to finishing her college degree. She reentered community college and made the honor role. Soon afterward, she was accepted to the university and began her program in elementary education.

Prior to her first semester in the College of Education, Dawn had extensive experience working with children. She spent time as a volunteer working with the children of AIDS patients. Most of her experience with children came from her years teaching swimming. Dawn spoke quite fondly of her days as a swimming teacher: "Put me around kids all day long and I'm a happy person. Put me in a pool around kids and I'm even a happier person (P4I1 1/9). Dawn seemed to derive a great deal of confidence from knowing that she was guaranteed a job as a swimming teacher upon graduation.

From the outset, Dawn did not look forward to participating in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. She claimed that she knew nothing about Bright Futures prior to attending mentoring orientations. Dawn said that working in public housing neighborhoods did not pose a problem for her; she had volunteered at a center for unwed high school-aged mothers that was close to two of the mentoring learning centers, so she knew something about the locations of the learning centers. Dawn's primary concern about being a mentor was having sufficient time for her studies and her field experience; Dawn worked part time and took a full load of courses and had little time left over for studying, much less mentoring.

Despite having said she did not look forward to Bright Futures, Dawn said that she was excited about working with a

child since she had not done so since she began her studies at the university. Her mentee was nine years of age; Dawn was a bit concerned as most of her experience with children was with seven-year-olds or younger. Nevertheless, Dawn decided to accept a nine-year-old for the challenge it posed. With regard to her expectations of her mentee, Dawn said, "I expected a stupid kid" (P4I1 10/4). She also said that she felt "a little nervous, . . . excited" (P4I1 10/18) when I asked her about her reaction to working in her mentee's neighborhood. Though she knew very little about the mentoring learning centers, she knew that the neighborhoods surrounding the learning centers were better maintained aesthetically than the housing projects she knew from her hometown.

Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach

Dawn's mentee was in the fourth grade and was the third of four children in her family. She lived with her mother and siblings in a duplex next to the learning center. Dawn's mentee got involved in Bright Futures under different circumstances than most mentees; she was playing outside of the learning center when the teacher at the site recruited her to work with Dawn; scheduling problems forced Dawn's assigned mentee to decline participation. Dawn was quite pleased to report that her mentee was eager to participate and was willing to do anything Dawn proposed for their sessions. Dawn also noted that her mentee was a quiet, polite, and thoughtful child who distinguished herself from many other mentees by being willing and content to sit and work inside the learning center.

Throughout her interviews, Dawn maintained that her mentee was "a smart kid" (P4I2 2/16) who did not need to focus intensively on academics in mentoring. Based on this assessment, Dawn planned enriching activities such as keeping a daily journal, creative writing projects, art projects, and cooking. Despite repeated experiences with her mentee during which she struggled to understand and follow Dawn's directions, Dawn maintained her position of believing her mentee needed no help with remedial academics. At no time during her interviews did Dawn mention that her mentee as actually staffed part time in a special education classroom; it was not clear that Dawn had any knowledge that her mentee often did not work on the same academic level as her peers.

Given Dawn's strong belief that her mentee was "very bright" (P4I4 1/30) and that "everything that comes out of her mouth is well-thought-out" (P4I2 7/25), it is not surprising that she experienced relatively few dilemmas or problems compared to the other three participants in this study; she mentioned dilemmas of knowing how to teach 29 times (see Table 4-2).

Sessions or activities do not go as planned

Dawn was convinced that her mentee was bright and capable and made references to this belief from her first meeting with her mentee. Dawn stated, "She's a smart kid" (P4I2 2/16) after having completed an informal interview for the purpose of getting to know her mentee. Dawn also had very complimentary things to say about her mentee with regard to her thinking: "She's a very thoughtful little girl, . . . very thoughtful" (P4I2 7/24). Dawn repeatedly emphasized that her mentee was highly intelligent. Dawn's assumptions

about her mentee's capabilities became a theme throughout Dawn's interviews that seemed to provide her with the rationale to focus more on creative and leisurely activities in mentoring sessions.

Dawn did not always find her mentee easy to work with. On a few occasions, Dawn's mentee was not able to complete lessons or activities in ways that demonstrated that she understood what she was doing. Consequently, Dawn mentioned the dilemma of sessions or activities not going as planned six times in three interviews. Dawn described this dilemma in the context of an art activity designed to help her get to know her mentee:

> I told her she had to put some words on her paper. It had to be more than just pictures. I showed her how I had cut out "college" for mine, and I asked her why she thought I picked out college, "Because you're in college." And I cut out "proud". And I asked her why she thought I cut out proud, "Because you're proud of yourself?" I said, "Sure! That's why I cut it out." I really wanted her to cut out some words, but then I noticed, and see, this was another time I don't think I explained myself very well, because she was reading the articles [laughing] . . .and that's not what I wanted her to do, I wanted her to pick out some of the bold thick words. So we went through that, and . . . what did she cut out? . . . She picked out "American" and she picked out "style". She had a hard time with that word. She asked me what it was, she couldn't get the "y" . . . I think there's a . . . I don't think she quite understood what I was looking for. (P4I2 8/27)

It became clear to Dawn that she was not going to attain her goal of learning about her mentee from the collage and that her plans were not working. This dilemma was derived from Dawn's assumptions about her own capabilities as a planner combined with her assumptions about her mentee's capabilities and background knowledge. The dilemma arose when Dawn realized that she was not going to achieve her goals for the

session, which meant she would have to improvise. Dawn faced this dilemma again when she attempted to introduce a writing project with a mystery theme:

> I brought in a book, . . . a mystery book I found on a bookshelf, . . . was trying to explain how you create a mystery and not make it [the answer to the mystery] obvious. It was hard. And if I had more time, I think I would have been able to achieve that, but we ran out of time. I explained to her, you know, we need to choose something else because we don't have time. (P4I8 15/3)

Dawn recognized that she was facing a dilemma as she discovered that she was not going to accomplish what she had planned. The success of Dawn's plan depended upon her mentee having all the prerequisite knowledge required for the activity; however, Dawn's mentee was not able to understand the concept of a mystery. As a result, the remainder of Dawn's plans for the session were useless.

Getting and maintaining the mentee's attention

Dawn believed that she had been fortunate to have been assigned a mentee who was an "easy kid" (P4I4 6/3), or a compliant and easily managed child. She repeatedly mentioned having an easy time working with her mentee. For example, Dawn described that she could expect to have her mentee's full attention even when her mentee was not intrinsically motivated. Dawn said, "I think even the day she wasn't willing to [do what I had planned], she would have done it. If I'd had said let's do it, she would have done it. She's a very easy kid, . . . very easy going" (P4I4 6/1). Dawn explained further when I asked her how she would describe her mentee's compliant disposition:

> I just say that she's so easy going. She's so willing to do [whatever is asked of her] and she really likes school. This is one of those kids who enjoys being in

> school, so I think she really enjoys the things we do after school. I feel sorry for some of the other mentors sometimes. They have a really tough kid. She's just so laid-back and so fun. (P4I4 6/13)

Considering Dawn's description, it is not surprising that she noted so few dilemmas related to generating and maintaining interest.

While Dawn's view of her mentee as "easy" was accurate for the majority of the time Dawn and her mentee spent together, Dawn's mentee did demonstrate resistance on at least one occasion. When Dawn experienced difficulty getting her mentee to participate willingly in a writing activity, Dawn attributed the origin of the dilemma to her mentee:

> On Monday we worked, . . . she worked on her journal a little bit and then we did some work on the computers. She [the mentee] really wasn't into the writing on that day at all. She got over that real quick . . . Like, on Monday, she [Dawn's mentee] just wasn't in the mood to do any writing skills or a lot of interactive skills with me. So I kind of [thought], "Okay, what am I going to do now?" (P4I4 4/5)

Dawn spoke with an air of confidence in her experience as she confirmed that it was a risk to try to proceed when a child demonstrated resistance:

> If a kid's not in the mood for something, why force it? That's going to make them hate it [the activity]. That's going to make them hate coming [to mentoring]. So you don't want to force something on them . . . I imagine when she wasn't willing to, or . . . wasn't excited or ready to do the writing things we wanted to do, I had to kind of come up with a quick answer. (P4I4 5/8)

Dawn's dilemma involved her having to make a difficult choice because of her mentee's resistance. Dawn had to decide whether to continue with her plans to have her mentee write in her journal or create a new activity on the spot. Dawn knew that a wrong decision on her part would disrupt the

momentum of her mentoring session for that day and possibly have implications for subsequent sessions.

Getting the mentee to talk

Dawn echoed the view of the other participants that a lack of conversation during mentoring sessions indicated a dilemma. While Dawn appreciated her mentee's even temperament and overall compliance, she considered her mentee's occasional silence troubling; she mentioned it three times in one interview. Dawn believed this dilemma originated with her mentee, whom Dawn characterized in her last interview as, "She's so shy" (P4I8 11/1). In her second interview, Dawn described her mentee's reluctance to talk like this:

> She's not a chatty person. She answers very easily to questions asked. I mean, she'll explain her answers, but she hasn't started any conversations, you know? . . . I sent her home the first day with, you know, "You come back with some questions for me." And I still had to prompt her to ask me a question. (P4I2 4/34)

The mentee's reluctance to assume equal responsibility for initiating conversation frustrated Dawn throughout her field experience. Dawn described her difficulty with getting her mentee to converse:

> While we were doing [the journal], I was able to kind of get a little more out of her about her family [while] she was cutting and pasting. I was asking her about her brothers and sister, what she likes about school. (P4I3 4/27)

Dawn related that she felt concerned when her mentee was not talking:

> The only thing was that, you know, the silence. I really don't want to have any uncomfortable times there. My plan is . . . I think um, I think I need to keep the conversation going a little bit more, ask her [the mentee] a little, a few more things. (P4I2 4/31)

Dawn faced the difficult decision of whether to ask a question or provide a prompt or wait until the silence passed. Dawn's dilemma arose from her struggle to decide whether keeping the conversation going was her responsibility, and if so, what to do about it.

Dealing with unsatisfactory conditions or support

Dawn was the only participant to identify dilemmas stemming from how the mentoring program was organized, implemented, and maintained; she mentioned this kind of dilemma three times in two interviews. The conditions (under which the mentors work) include the locations of the learning centers in the public housing neighborhoods, the availability of parking for mentors' automobiles, lighting outside the learning center, and availability of materials and games for mentors to use. Support includes the amount of effort extended by the staff of Bright Futures, including site managers, supervising teachers, and the director of the program. Also included as support are the instructors and professors in the College of Education.

Safety is an aspect of mentoring that receives a great deal of attention in the Bright Futures Mentoring Program. The staff of Bright Futures discusses safety issues in all orientations with mentors at the beginning of the field experience. Suggestions about safety for mentors and their mentees are also given in the handbook for mentoring. In its more than seven years of operation, Bright Futures has established a reputation as a safe and efficiently run program.

Despite these facts, mentors discover situations or conditions that are either difficult to predict or remedy.

In Dawn's case, her sessions were in the early evening because of her busy class schedule at the university. Dawn's dilemma surfaced as uncertainty over what to do about personal safety. After Daylight Savings Time ended, it was dark when Dawn left the learning center. Dawn described how she felt about leaving the center in the dark:

> Oh, it was that 5:45 or 5:15 thing. I mean, there was just no other time available [for mentoring sessions] because of my 4:00 class. That was a pain in the butt. But especially leaving there at night. I was talking to somebody about it. I hated leaving there [the learning center] after the time change. There was no light outside. It was terrible. It was very dangerous, especially . . . it was not a safe feeling. And I think it should definitely be addressed. I put that down on my evaluation for the class . . . that not a safe feeling at all. (P4I8 14/1)

In addition to her belief that it was unsafe to walk to her car outside the learning center after dark, Dawn was also concerned because there were few mentors at the learning center by the time her sessions ended. Although she car pooled to the learning center before the change to Eastern Standard Time, she drove alone to the learning center later in the semester. Dawn's dilemma came as a result of her apprehensions about her safety and misgivings about her busy schedule. She felt tension as to whether to complain about the poor lighting, because her schedule would not allow for any other options with regard to mentoring sessions.

Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing Myself: Dealing With Emotions

Dawn encountered dilemmas that elicited strong emotional reactions; however, these dilemmas did not originate with her mentee or their mentoring activities. Dawn experienced the most difficulty dealing with her emotions related to dilemmas involving another mentor, her personal life, or the demands

of being in her major program. The dilemma that posed the greatest emotional challenge for Dawn arose from a plan for a field trip involving Dawn and another mentor, Niki, with whom Dawn had classes and car pooled to the learning center. Since Dawn and Niki had classes and mentoring sessions at the same times, they shared rides to the learning center and often planned and implemented activities together. Dawn described how her relationship with Niki changed after plans dissolved for a field trip to a local zoo:

> Well, a good example is on Monday, [Niki] and I, who I car pool with, she and I decided we were going to take the kids to the zoo . . . on Wednesday she [Niki] tells me, "Well, I can't do it on Sunday . . ." I was originally going to do it on Saturday morning. [Niki said] "Oh, let's do it on Sunday." [I said,] "Okay, we'll do it on Sunday morning." Wednesday [Niki responded, saying], "I can't do it on Sunday morning, for this reason and this reason, . . . what about Sunday afternoon?" I called the zoo, they close at two. So, I'm like, "We can work with this." So Wednesday, we decide we're going to take them to the movies on Sunday. at three, get home about six, do lunch or something in between there. Today she tells me, "I don't really want to take them . . . you know, he's already seen the Little Mermaid." I don't think that's the point. They just want to get out with us, we want to take them on a trip, they don't care. So really, she's backing out again and I just told her, that's the last time we'll do it together. (P4I7 1/3)

Dawn's dilemma was the extreme discomfort she felt as a result of her anger at having to go on the field trip alone and at the same time, maintain a positive relationship with Niki. Dawn tried to accommodate Niki and follow through on her agreement with her mentee regarding a field trip, but Niki canceled every plan they made together. Dawn expressed how the dilemma grew out of her willingness to compromise:

> I just gave, and gave, and gave . . . and she just took, took, took, and took this time . . . and that just really . . . no more. You know, sometimes it's like

> with the group projects [for college classes], it's just easier to do it on your own. Just do what you gotta do. (P4I7 2/28)

Dawn went on to describe her emotional reaction to her dilemma saying she was "bothered, . . . [laughs] . . . that's a very nice word for what I'm feeling. It was just unfair to me and unfair to the kid, . . . her kid" (P4I7 3/13). Dawn's willingness to compromise caused Dawn to have to reschedule her field trip on more than one occasion. As the postponements increased, Dawn became more frustrated until she grew angry enough to discontinue working with Niki altogether and sharing rides to the learning center.

Dawn's Dilemmas of Knowing About the Mentee: Mentee Lacks Knowledge, Skills, Ability, or Aptitude

Dawn maintained the belief that her mentee was intelligent and academically talented. She did not appear to be open to evidence that contradicted this belief. It was not surprising, therefore, that she made only one mention of a dilemma in the category of knowing about the mentee. During one session, Dawn's mentee was writing and Dawn noted that her mentee used no punctuation marks. Dawn said, "Her writing . . . she's just a very, um, she strings everything together. There's no stops in it" (P4I4 7/27). Dawn viewed her mentee's lack of knowledge as an obstacle to achieving her main goal for a semester project, the completion of a journal with daily entries throughout the field experience. When Dawn realized that her mentee was not proficient at using punctuation, she faced having to either teach punctuation skills or proceed with the journal regardless of punctuation errors. Either choice carried with it the

potential to expose Dawn's misjudgment of her mentee's capabilities.

Dawn's Role and Patterns of Dilemma Resolution

Dawn's main aim in her first field experience as a preservice teacher was to endure the experience. Dawn was candid about the fact that she did not choose to participate in the Bright Futures field experience; rather, she perceived mentoring as an obligation of her teacher education program. For Dawn, completing the mentoring field experience was a matter of finding out what was expected of her and finding a way to meet those expectations. Nevertheless, Dawn was very determined to complete her studies at the unversity and satisfy all requirements in order that she could receive a degree.

Dawn's plan was to earn a degree in education in order to pursue a career as a professional swim instructor. In Dawn's view, she needed a credential to add credibility to her resume in order to obtain a respectable position among professional swim school instructors and directors. In her first interview, Dawn described her thinking about her plans for her degree:

> Well, actually while I was there at the [national swim school] conventions, I realized that everything these people are doing, everything, . . . all these people that are writing, these books about swimming, about teaching, you know, and telling me are things I was doing five or six years ago. What do they have that I don't have? I was looking at their credentials, . . . doctorate, masters, degree, degree, degree that sort of [helped me decide] . . . Okay I'm ready to go back [to college). (P4I1 6/3)

Dawn's main focus in life, as in college, was to finish her degree. As a result, much of what Dawn said about dilemmas

revolved around obstacles to successful completion of the first semester of her teacher education program.

Dawn was candid about the adversity she faced prior to and during her Bright Futures field experience and identified dilemmas arising from sources from both within and outside of mentoring. The pattern of resolution that emerged from Dawn's descriptions of her encounters with dilemmas was Doing whatever was necessary to survive the field experience, or in Dawn's words, "Just do what you gotta do" (P4I7 2/28). By this, Dawn meant that she was focused on getting things done in a manner that would satisfy the requirements of the field experience and not disrupt her already busy life. Dawn mentioned resolving dilemmas by doing whatever was necessary 45 times. Dawn's pattern of resolution was consistent for all dilemmas in all categories.

Within the dilemma category of knowing how to teach, Dawn mentioned doing whatever was necessary to solve dilemmas 32 times. One such dilemma originated with Dawn's mentee and represented one of her most significant dilemmas. Dawn decided at the outset of her field experience to make a journal writing exercise the main project for mentoring. She planned to have her mentee work on the journal every session and that the journal would provide Dawn and her mentee with mutually beneficial opportunities. For Dawn, the journal would provide information about her mentee's experiences both in and out of school. The journal also provided an opportunity for Dawn's mentee to practice writing and an outlet for sharing experiences with Dawn. Additionally, Dawn considered the journal to be worthy of presenting at the end of mentoring as her mentee's semester project.

A major dilemma arose for Dawn when her mentee misplaced the journal at the end of the fourth week of the field experience. Dawn described her dilemma and how she attempted to resolve it as follows:

> She [Dawn's mentee] lost her journal. I gave it to her to take home with her to show her mom, cause I sent a note home. She comes back on Wednesday, "I can't find it." So I told her, "We have to really try and find this for me tonight." I told her, "It's just as much for me as it is for you." And, she's going, "I'll look, I'll look." "You've gotta find it, you know?" Big part, cause it's something I wanted from the beginning to end. Now when you send it home with her that one day, and she lost it, so that kind of bothered me . . . Well, it's just more for myself. I mean, it's not a huge deal but it's definitely putting a kink in my plans for her and for me, because I really wanted to see if there's any difference in her writing, me working with her, if there's any difference in her attitude, see if there's any difference in a lot of things and that's how I was going about it by having her write in this journal every day. I suppose I could make another one, but this is four weeks into it. (P4I6 1/11)

When her mentee lost the journal, Dawn related feeling that her efforts in mentoring were "going down the drain" (P4I6 2/4). Dawn's resolution involved motivating her mentee to search for the journal and assigning the responsibility for recovering the journal to her mentee. Dawn surmised that making her mentee aware of how important the journal was would compell her to locate and return it as soon as possible. Assigning the responsibility for the journal to her mentee made it possible for Dawn to protect her own expenditures of time and energy; that is, Dawn would not have to add further responsibilities to an already full schedule. Dawn felt that she could not afford to invest more time and energy in the journal than she already had, so she placed the responsibility on her mentee for recovering this important artifact.

Dawn's initial reaction to the loss of the journal was irritation and dismay. Part of Dawn's reaction stemmed from her concerns about time; from the beginning of the semester, Dawn considered time constraints to be high on her list of personal obstacles. In her first interview, Dawn expressed feeling quite worried about keeping up with her mentoring responsibilities since she was already overwhelmed by her full load of course work. Within four weeks of the beginning of the semester, Dawn quit her part-time job so that she could keep up with her studies. When she found out that she would also have to participate in Bright Futures; Dawn said, "I just barely have time to breathe anymore" (P4I1 9/1). It seemed to Dawn that her mentee had created yet another obstacle on top of others that Dawn felt ill-prepared to contend with.

Dawn's interest in self-preservation was echoed in her resolution to another dilemma in the category of knowing how to teach which was derived from Dawn's difficulties explaining her expectations to her mentee. When describing the aforementioned activity that entailed constructing a collage, Dawn related how she had failed to be clear about her expectations and, as a result, her mentee made a collage that did not reflect Dawn's intentions. In that situation, Dawn's mentee misunderstood which words to include in her collage and how to paste the pictures on the collage. Dawn described how she attempted to resolve this dilemma:

> When I had her cut out her collage, I told her things could overlap a little but what I was thinking was overlap a little bit . . . and things were totally covering other pictures so I didn't really explain that very well. And then, also, on the words when I told her I wanted her to put words, but she was looking at the tiny articles and she was looking for a word in the

> article rather than a bold headline. I didn't explain very well. But I didn't really have an opportunity, . . . I didn't really need to explain that in-depth. (P4I3 10/28)

Dawn chose to do what was most expedient when attempting to resolve this dilemma. Since Dawn considered time and energy to be commodities that were in short supply, she chose not to teach her mentee how to do the collage properly.

Dawn's desire to get through mentoring was stronger than her desire to help her mentee understand what was expected for the collage activity. For Dawn, stopping to explain how to complete the collage was a risk because it required extra time and energy. Dawn allowed her mentee to paste pictures so that some were covered entirely and select words and letters that did not meet Dawn's original objectives. Instead, Dawn protected her investment of time and energy by simply moving on to the next activity on her plan for the session.

Dawn's survival theme was apparent in her description of the aforementioned dilemma that arose from a conflict Dawn had with Niki, the mentor with whom Dawn shared class and mentoring schedules. Dawn and Niki planned a field trip to the local zoo with their mentees, but their plans changed as Niki's interest in the field trip wavered. The dilemma developed over several days as Niki changed her mind every time they spoke about the field trip. Dawn repeatedly tried to accomodate Niki's changes in plans and chose to compromise about the destinations, days, and times for the trip.

To Dawn, it seemed that Niki was being insensitive to everyone involved, but especially to Dawn; after all, Dawn had as many responsibilities as Niki when it came to

mentoring and course work. Nevertheless, Niki declined to go on the field trip despite Dawn's best efforts. This made Dawn feel emotions that she could not reconcile. Dawn's reaction was to retreat completely from the partnership with Niki. Rather than risk being dissappointed again by Niki, Dawn decided against making any subsequent plans with Niki and go on the field trip without her, hence Dawn's strategy of, "Just do what you gotta do" (P4I7 2/31). Furthermore, Dawn resolved not to work with Niki for the remainder of mentoring. Dawn's resolution was to lower her expectations of Niki in an effort to protect herself from future dilemmas. To Dawn, self-reliance was familiar and safe; doing otherwise meant exposing herself to more dilemmas and Dawn was not willing to risk additional loss of time and energy. Dawn explained further in the same interview how she had dealt with this dilemma:

> It [Niki's decision] bothered me. I think bothered was a nice way of saying I was angry. Just cross out the bothered there. I don't like to have set plans and then for somebody to [cancel them]. My days are too busy to, . . . too busy for that. (P4I7 4/5)

This dilemma was costly to Dawn emotionally as well as in terms of time, so Dawn retreated to a protective and solitary position that would ensure that this dilemma would not reoccur.

Dawn described another dilemma in the category of knowing myself that contains evidence of the intensity with which Dawn approached her self-protective orientation. After resolving her dilemma with Niki, Dawn drove alone to the learning center. In the latter weeks of the field experience, Daylight Savings Time took effect and Dawn's sessions ended after sundown. Dawn kept her word to her

mentee and took her to a movie, which ended in the early evening. After taking her mentee home, Dawn was approached by a group of neighborhood children. Dawn described how she reacted to a dilemma that arose as the children employed a vigorous strategy to get Dawn's attention:

> When I brought [my mentee] back when we went to a movie, these [neighborhood] kids just came out of the woodwork and were hanging on my car . . . I'm trying to pull out [of the driveway] and they're hitting the windows and begging to come in, "Gimme some money, gimme some of this . . ." You just don't disrespect me like that. I slammed on the brake, and I yelled at them and I told them "YOU DO NOT TREAT ME LIKE THIS; YOU DO NOT TREAT MY PROPERTY LIKE THIS." [The children responded,] "[The children mentioned Dawn's mentee] said you're nice . . ." [Dawn said,] "Oh, I am, as long as you respect me, NOW GET OFF MY CAR OR I'M GOING TO RUN YOU OVER." So that was something I don't experience in my neighborhood. You don't, . . . I don't find out what the kids had to play with in my neighborhood. It wasn't a dilemma . . . well, it might have been, but I solved it so quickly . . . I was so mad. I have never seen anything like that. Just twenty kids on my car. Mmmmmm Mmmmm [Dawn was shaking her head from side to side, spoke firmly with her lips pursed and eyes closed]. (P4I8 5/24)

Dawn's description illustrates how she was capable of standing alone in the face of what she considered great adversity. Dawn was not going to let anyone or anything interfere with her plans; she was confident that she had acted appropriately in this situation and showed no signs of having reconsidered alternatives to her threats to the children.

Summary

Dawn was an uncommitted mentor whose main aim for mentoring was to get through the experience. In Dawn's view, mentoring was a requirement rather than an opportunity and an obstacle that she felt prepared to overcome. For Dawn, successfully completing the mentoring field experience was a

matter of showing up at her designated times at the learning center and doing what was expected of her. Of the four participants in this study, Dawn spent the least time planning for and implementing mentoring sessions. She mentioned encountering and resolving dilemmas infrequently compared with the other participants; the total number of dilemmas Dawn mentioned was 15 in her largest domain, knowing how to teach subject matter, or 19 percent of the total for all four participants in that domain. The dilemma she mentioned most often (six times) was sessions or activities not going as planned. Dawn's pattern of resolution for mentoring dilemmas was doing whatever was necessary to survive the field experience, which she mentioned 45 times.

Dawn was committed to finishing her teacher education program at all costs so that she could earn her degree and become a swim school instructor. She was not inclined to invest effort and reflection in mentoring beyond that which would earn her passing grade. Therefore, Dawn's resolution strategy of doing whatever was necessary to survive the field experience meant doing the minimum amount of work and spending the minimum amount of time planning for and implementing mentoring sessions. Dawn was candid about not being a willing participant in Bright Futures; rather, Dawn said, "I didn't go into this voluntarily. Obviously, I did it [the Bright Futures field experience] because it was [required for] school" (P4I6 3/23).

Comparison of Cindy and Dawn: The Mentors Who Were Not Committed

Cindy and Dawn have been described in this investigation as the mentors who demonstrated a lack of or diminished commitment. Cindy's and Dawn's low levels of commitment

became more clear in their resolution patterns. These two participants dedicated intermittent, minimal, or no effort toward helping their mentees to be more capable of success in academics and were inconsistent in their choices of strategies to this end. Cindy and Dawn also demonstrated negative attitudes toward the field experience and occasionally considered mentoring a burden. Throughout the field experience, Cindy and Dawn dedicated inconsistent or decreased effort to planning and implementing mentoring sessions that were enriching or that contributed to their mentees' academic improvement. This section presents a summary of the similarities and differences between Cindy and Dawn, especially their dilemmas, resolution patterns, approaches to mentoring, and the roles they chose to play in mentoring.

Comparison of all four participants' total number of dilemmas in the category of knowing how to teach reveals that Cindy and Dawn experienced dilemmas quite differently overall as compared with Annie and Betsy. Both Cindy and Dawn experienced dilemmas in subcategories that no other participant mentioned; Cindy was the only participant to mention dilemmas of knowing how to communicate effectively, and Dawn was the only participant to mention the dilemma of dealing with unsatisfactory conditions or support (see Table 4-2). Dawn was the most distinctive participant in terms of the overall number of domains of dilemmas she mentioned; of 13 total domains for the study within the dilemma category of knowing how to teach, Dawn mentioned dilemmas in eight of them. For the remaining categories of dilemmas, together Cindy and Dawn mentioned dilemmas of knowing myself the

greatest number of times for this study. Cindy's overall number of domains was 93, which was 13 percent higher than the next highest number (Annie) of occurrences for participants in this study.

The differences between Cindy's and Dawn's experiences working with children helps explain their differences from the other participants; Cindy had very little experience with children and had no siblings, while Dawn taught swimming classes from the time she was ten years old and had four siblings, including one who was younger. The majority of Cindy's experience with children was part time babysitting, whereas Dawn spent several weeks out of the year working with small children in an instructional capacity at a swim school. Their backgrounds influenced Cindy's and Dawn's abilities to identify and choose strategies for resolving teaching dilemmas.

While Cindy and Dawn together mentioned 84 percent of the dilemmas in the category of knowing myself, Cindy mentioned dilemmas in this category 21 percent more frequently than Dawn (see Table 4-3). In the category of knowing the mentee, Cindy mentioned dilemmas of this sort 15 times, as compared with Dawn having mentioned only one (see Table 4-4). Cindy also identified five dilemmas in the category of knowing the people in the neighborhood, while Dawn mentioned dilemmas in this category once (see Table 4-5).

The differences between Cindy's and Dawn's identification and resolution of dilemmas was due, in part, to the differences between their mentees. Cindy's mentee was an active second-grade boy who was rarely interested in

engaging in school-like activities. Dawn's mentee was a fourth-grade girl who was compliant, preferred to work indoors, and enjoyed completing academic exercises. Most of Cindy's mentoring sessions included negotiations with her mentee wherein she had to trade playing time for time spent working on academics. Dawn's mentee was willing to do whatever Dawn wanted her to do and only showed hesitance when reading aloud was required. On a few occasions, Cindy's mentee was defiant and refused to do the activities Cindy planned. Clearly the temperaments and attitudes of their mentees affected how Cindy and Dawn identified and resolved dilemmas.

Dawn was different from Cindy in the way she approached resolving dilemmas. For Dawn, expediency was the primary goal in resolving dilemmas. Conversely, Cindy spent a great deal of time thinking and talking about dilemmas. Cindy mentioned her attempts to resolve dilemmas twice as often as Dawn and had three distinct strategies she used for dilemma resolution. While both Cindy and Dawn used strategies that denoted a desire to limit their investment of time and energy in dilemma resolution, Cindy was willing to search for and plan better methods of teaching and getting her mentee involved in mentoring sessions. Dawn was more inclined to improvise and rarely spent time outside of mentoring sessions either searching for or planning activities.

Cindy's resolution patterns suggest that she was often struggling in her mentoring sessions, and this resulted from a combination of her lack of experience and confidence from working with children and her mentee's temperament. Dawn was frequently overconfident about her ability to teach and

considered her teacher preparation program to be merely a credential; she already knew how to teach and simply needed a degree to be competitive in the job market. Cindy questioned not only whether she was capable of teaching her mentee, but also questioned whether she really wanted to be a teacher. Cindy acknowledged that she did not have a sufficient repertoire for planning and implementing mentoring sessions, which is exemplified by her mentioning searching for the correct procedure 30 times. Dawn relied on her background knowledge most often when she encountered dilemmas and seldom looked to outside sources for assistance.

That Cindy mentioned twice as many dilemmas and attempts at resolutions suggests that she was much more committed to mentoring than Dawn. Her level of commitment was greater and she spoke more freely than Dawn about dilemmas, seldom hesitating to mention anything that posed a problem for her. Dawn was very guarded about what she would divulge and frequently dismissed problems noted by the investigator in observations as being anomalies or not worthy of being classified as dilemmas. Dawn remained at a safe distance from anything to do with her teacher preparation program, including mentoring; she was determined that nothing was going to get in the way of her earning a degree. Cindy took mentoring very personally and was very discouraged when she was not able to achieve her goals for the field experience.

Similarities and differences in Cindy's and Dawn's identification and resolution strategies for dilemmas resulted from distinct choices as to their roles as mentors. Cindy believed that her role in mentoring was to help improve her mentee's academic skills by making schoolwork more

interesting to her mentee. Cindy knew that her mentee could barely read, write, and do basic mathematics, so she felt compelled to assume a teaching role. Dawn was convinced that her mentee was self-motivated to work on academics, therefore her role was to take charge and keep her mentee busy. Neither Cindy nor Dawn had adequate skills to achieve their goals. Cindy's dedication to helping her mentee was subject to her level of confidence and feelings of self-assuredness. As her feelings about her abilities wavered, so did her dedication to helping her mentee. Dawn's dedication to mentoring and her mentee's needs was questionable from the outset; she was dedicated to her personal goals and was not willing to allow her mentee's needs to interfere with her plans for completing the field experience at all costs.

In Chapter 6, the findings of this study are presented and explained using theoretical frameworks from previous research. The findings are discussed as they relate to the preparation of preservice teachers to work well with diverse learners. Recommendations are included for further research and for practitioners in the field of teacher education.

CHAPTER 6
PREVALENT DILEMMAS AND DIVERSE RESOLUTION STRATEGIES: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted for the purpose of gaining insights about the dilemmas faced by four preservice teachers in an early field experience working with low socioeconomic status African American children in public housing neighborhoods. Researchers who have investigated early field experiences in teacher education have tended to focus on preservice teachers' attitudes toward diverse learners. Few studies exist that document what preservice teachers actually do in their field experiences, especially regarding the dilemmas they face while working with diverse learners. The Bright Futures Mentoring Program field experience afforded a unique opportunity for learning about what kinds of dilemmas white, middle class, female mentors faced and how they resolved them. Such information can be used by teacher educators who provide scaffolds of support for preservice teachers in early field experiences such as Bright Futures.

In order to identify the dilemmas faced by the participants, interviews were conducted at least six times during the 10 week field experience. Observations were conducted weekly for each participant. Data were collected from transcripts and field notes as well as from artifacts produced by the participants as they completed course work concurrently with the field experience. The data collected

represented the participants' descriptions of kinds of dilemmas they identified and attempted to resolve related to pedagogy (knowing how to teach); personal problems (knowing myself); the children who participated in Bright Futures (knowing the mentee); and the parents, caregivers, and neighbors of the children who participated in Bright Futures (knowing the people in the neighborhood). The patterns that emerged from analysis of the data provided insights about the factors that influenced the participants' deliberations and decisions as they conducted activity sessions with their mentees.

The data were analyzed using procedures described by Spradley (1980; 1981) and Yin (1993). Data were organized into domains of the 21 dilemmas that were clustered into four categories. Based on the numbers of dilemmas in domains, the four dilemma categories were organized into the following hierarchy in order of prevalence (see Table 4-1): (a) knowing how to teach, (b) knowing myself, (c) knowing the mentee, and (d) knowing about the people in the neighborhood. Dilemmas of knowing how to teach comprised the largest category of domains, mentioned most frequently by all four participants.

As in Berlak and Berlak's (1981) study, the resolutions attempted by the four participants in this study occurred in unique patterns. Annie's main patterns of resolution included fixing the problem and monitoring the situation. Betsy's patterns of resolution included finding a way to do what the mentee wants to do, accepting responsibility, and showing affection to the child. Cindy's strategies for resolving dilemmas in mentoring included the patterns of

knowing your limits, searching for the correct procedure, and getting the mentee engaged. The pattern of resolution that emerged from Dawn's descriptions of her encounters with dilemmas was doing whatever was necessary to get through with the Bright Futures field experience. While each participant's pattern of resolution was unique, their purposes for resolving dilemmas were similar. Annie and Betsy were committed to their mentees' own learning. Additionally, Annie and Besty viewed the experience positively despite the myriad obstacles they encountered, and they persevered despite the difficulties they faced. Cindy and Dawn held more negative views of the field experience and were described as non-committed mentors, since their commitment to learning either waned or was sporadic over the course of the semester. At times, Cindy and Dawn were not committed to helping their mentees learn; they often ignored or overlooked dilemmas, and viewed mentoring as a negative experience to be endured. Participants' goals and their commitment to the goals of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program shed light on the factors that contribute to the success of the field experience.

Theoretical Framework: Dilemma Language and Lay Theory

The Berlaks constructed a framework of dilemma language derived from data gathered in 19 British schools that had been portrayed in educational publications as progressive and innovative. The researchers found little evidence to support claims of the British schools being hubs of innovation. In fact, the British teachers faced many of the same problems as their American counterparts and many of the problems common in American schools also persisted in the British schools.

When the Berlaks noted that the British schools were more like their American counterparts than they expected, the researchers sought an explanation. What they found was that teachers face many intangible obstacles that were common to some degree in all of the classrooms in which they conducted observations. The Berlaks describe these intangible obstacles as dilemmas and suggest that they are common in British and American classrooms. In order to explain how dilemmas act on teacher decision making and action, the Berlaks created a language of dilemmas. Dilemma language helps to illuminate the tensions that pull together or in opposition as teachers make decisions about the myriad problems of classroom teaching.

According to the Berlaks (1981), dilemmas can be categorized in three ways: control dilemmas, curriculum dilemmas, and societal dilemmas. Each category is linked to specific kinds of dilemmas teachers face on a regular basis. The Berlaks use their dilemma language to provide insights into the underlying reasons why teachers do what they do. The dichotomies of the individual dilemmas (e.g., learning is social v. learning is individual) provide a way to compare teachers and uncover their guiding assumptions. In order to illustrate how this works, the Berlaks (1981) demonstrated how dilemmas can be represented with graphic figures, such as continua and sets of axes, that depict the choices available to teachers. Plotting points on such figures based on observed dilemmas helps to shed light on the patterns of teachers' thinking and behavior.

While the Berlaks' dilemma language was the conceptual framework that provided a point of departure for this inquiry

into mentoring dilemmas, the specific terms the Berlaks used to describe dilemmas were not used for this study. That is not to say that the Berlaks' categories of curriculum, control, and social dilemmas were rejected; rather, terms used in this study were derived from the words of the participants to describe their dilemmas. Using the participants' own terms preserves the unique qualities of the participants' perspectives about dilemmas and the context in which they occurred. Mentoring, by its nature, is idiosyncratic and often quite distinct from classroom teaching. Therefore, dilemma language was developed by an inductive process, based on the words and actions of mentors. The investigator constructed terms to describe clusters of similar mentoring dilemmas and named them according to the most common kinds of dilemmas the participants faced in the Bright Futures field experience.

The four categories of dilemmas experienced by the participants in this study were: (a) knowing how to teach; (b) knowing myself; (c) knowing about the mentee, and (d) knowing the people in the neighborhood. These categories represented dilemmas that were particular to the four preservice teachers who participated in this study. In the sections that follow, explanations will be provided for the hierarchy of dilemmas constructed for this investigation and the particular dilemma language. Further, the participants' patterns of resolution will be explained using research on the influences that affect preservice teachers' decision making.

Dilemma Language and Mentoring Dilemmas

According to Berlak and Berlak (1981), dilemmas are indicators of teachers' priorities--dilemmas exist when a person perceives or feels the tension stemming from a problematic situation and then must choose between competing alternatives for resolution. Teachers do not always perceive all problematic situations that could be described as dilemmas; rather, they identify the ones that have some personal relevance and meaning. Dilemmas that receive the most attention are given priority status. In the case of the four participants, their priorities were improving their methods and the activities they chose for mentoring sessions. The Berlaks explain further that teachers' values are apparent in their identification and resolution of dilemmas, especially as they act as agents of the mainstream culture.

Throughout their lives as students, teachers assimilate knowledge about what teaching entails and what their culture considers to be valuable knowledge. The Berlaks (1981) describe this process:

> Individuals, including teachers, throughout their lives, take from experience and continuously adjust their conceptions of what is valued knowledge, what is a fair allocation of status and other social resources, how much control they and others have over their own lives and destinies et cetera. The meanings teachers take from experience during their schooling, their formal training at college or university, during their careers as teachers in encounters with children, administrators and parents, in their lives as citizens and parents from the countless events in their personal and social histories, continuously affect their patterns of resolution and their views of the desirability and practicality of resolving differently the dilemmas they face as teachers. (p. 214)

The data gathered for this investigation indicate that the four participants viewed pedagogical dilemmas as being the

most important, based on the number of times they mentioned dilemmas of knowing how to teach. As the participants chose most frequently to focus on resolving pedagogical dilemmas, they provided clues to their tacit beliefs about what was most important for them to do in mentoring. This is especially noteworthy, according to the Berlaks, since students take meanings from teachers' patterns of resolution. The contradictions and meanings of the culture of the teacher (a dominant person from the dominant culture) are transmitted to students.

The participants often seemed self-absorbed as they talked during interviews about the problematic situations they faced; that is, they talked mostly about themselves and their own dilemmas related to playing their roles as mentors. This confirms one of the guiding assumptions that led to Bright Futures inception: White, middle class preservice teachers are largely unprepared to work well with culturally diverse learners (Haberman, 1996). It has been theorized that cultural dissonance is a problem affecting all white preservice teachers (Armaline, 1995); therefore, it would be expected that the participants would have mentioned frequently dilemmas related to knowing their mentees and the people in the neighborhoods. Instead, the participants talked most often about dilemmas of knowing how to teach. That is not to say that dilemmas related to knowing the mentee and knowing the people in the neighborhood were not present; rather, the participants assigned lower status and priority to dilemmas arising from cultural difference.

The Berlaks (1981) posit that teachers' behaviors correlate with their beliefs, which are reflections of their

experiences and culture. The participants in this study chose to behave in ways that indicate their acceptance of what Sugrue (1996) describes as a cultural archetype of teaching. Archetypes form the foundation of our systems of beliefs about teachers (Sugrue, 1996) and inform our "lay theories" about what teachers ought to be like and be able to do (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). Such belief systems are foundational to and mirrored in the participants' patterns of resolution for dilemmas. Resolution patterns are "outcomes of reflections (either in recent or distant past) upon their social experience" (Berlak & Berlak, 1981 p. 216).

Lay Theory and Mentoring Dilemmas

Preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching are strongly influenced by their experiences with and observations about their teachers (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). As stated by Fenstermacher and Soltis (1986), "what a teacher thinks teaching is . . . determines the direction, tone, and style of the teacher" (p. 5). Preservice teachers construct lay theories about teaching based on their many years of contact with teachers. Lay theories are defined as:

> Beliefs developed naturally over time without the influence of instruction. Preservice teachers do not consciously learn them at an announced, recognized moment from a formal teaching/learning episode. Rather, lay theories represent tacit knowledge lying dormant and unexamined by the student. Developed over long years of participation in and observation of classrooms (Lortie, 1975) and teaching/learning incidents occurring in schools, homes or the larger community (Measor, 1985; Sikes, 1987), lay theories are based on untutored interpretations of personal, lived experiences. (Holt-Reynolds, 1992 p. 326)

Preservice teachers' lay theories also are influenced by their experiences with families and friends, who tend to promote and reinforce their archetypes of teaching, or

"culturally embedded images of teachers and teaching" (Sugrue, 1996 p. 158). Teacher archetypes are the tacit, yet familiar, prototypical images of teachers that are common within a given cultural group. For example, American students can identify at some level with the role of the teacher that is characterized by authoritarian conduct and a traditional approach to instruction. This archetype is embedded in the beliefs and values of all members of our society who have been exposed directly and indirectly to it. Teachers are representatives of their cultures and the shared values that permeate all aspects of their work (Sugrue, 1996).

By the time they begin their preparation programs, preservice teachers have spent countless hours in their "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975), watching teachers work and having well-formed beliefs about what it means to be a teacher. Preservice teachers, then, enter the field considering themselves insiders to the profession. Such beliefs tend to be robust to efforts by teacher educators to have preservice teachers critique their entering assumptions about teaching (Pajares, 1992).

The findings from this study suggest that the participants' identification and resolution of mentoring dilemmas are manifestations of the lay theories with which they entered their teacher education program. These theories were influenced by the participants' experiences as students, babysitters, aunts and sisters, volunteers working with children, and from part time jobs that involved responsibilities similar to mentors. In particular, the findings of this investigation indicate that the participants

used familiar strategies for resolving dilemmas. The participants relied on strategies that either they had used themselves previously, or had observed being used by a teacher or person who held a position of authority.

To varying degrees, all four participants had unique lay theories about teaching that helped them define their roles as mentors. These lay theories were developed over the participants' lifetimes, especially as they observed their teachers and were influenced by discussions about good teaching (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). According to Holt-Reynolds (1992), by the time preservice teachers begin their preparation programs, their lay theories are largely reproductions of culturally defined archetypes for teachers. The participants' archetypes were consistent with the traditional view of teachers as transmitters of information and purveyors of prescribed curriculum. For the participants, mentoring differed very little from teaching. As their focus was teaching, resolving pedagogical dilemmas was their highest priority.

In order to understand the underlying factors influencing participants' patterns of dilemma resolution, it is necessary to surface and examine their lay theories as the roots of the roles the participants played in Bright Futures. The following sections describe each participant's unique approach to mentoring and the degree to which they reflect her lay theory. These theories were formed through the participants' experiences with children, their experiences as students, the influence of family, and work experience. Further, descriptions are provided about how each participant defined the Bright Futures experiences, followed by

explanations for the use of strategies in mentoring as they may be derived from her lay theory.

Annie's lay theory and approach to mentoring

Annie's lay theory included a view of the teacher as an authority and expert. To Annie, teachers were authorities because they had more experience and knowledge than students. Annie also believed that the roles and responsibilities of students and teachers were not similar or interchangeable; teachers and students act in distinct ways. When describing a routine activity from a mentoring session, Annie said, "She's [the mentee] writing out her paragraph, kind of slow, so I was drawing. I had nothing better to do, so I was like, 'Okay, I'll leave her alone and let her do her thing'" (P1I3 5/2). To Annie, her mentee had "her thing" to do while Annie had her own set of responsibilities that pertained to assuring that the activities are completed and done correctly. When describing how she maintained distance from her mentee in a writing activity, Annie said, "She'll [Annie's mentee] do a rough draft and I'll go back and correct it and try to, like, put it in more grammatical sense" (P1I4 4/4). As in traditional classroom instruction, Annie was the authority and expert who generated and directed all mentoring activities.

Before participating in the Bright Futures field experience, Annie spent time around children working as a volunteer for Child Health Services. Her role as a volunteer was to provide guidance for younger children who, like Annie, had spent time in foster homes. Annie considered herself to have knowledge about the needs of former foster children that could only come from first-hand experience. Her expert

knowledge, according to Annie, made her uniquely qualified to do volunteer work with the foster children. Annie described how she compared herself with other volunteers at Child Health Services who were not former foster children: "I basically do volunteer work with Child Health Services and all that. It's because I understand what they [foster children] are going through" (P1I1 7/18). Annie, a former foster child, differentiated her abilities from her colleagues who had not been foster children and who thought they understood what the foster children were thinking and feeling.

In response to her colleagues having made claims to have such understandings, Annie responded, "No you don't, you just haven't been there. Like, yeah, you've seen it day in and day out, but you haven't really experienced it" (P1I1 7/21). Annie placed a great deal of importance on first-hand experience. To Annie, experience indicated expertise and was the prerequisite for positions of authority. She helped foster children because she had knowledge and experience with Child Health Services as a client. Annie viewed mentoring similarly; she was qualified to be a mentor because she had spent more years in school than her mentee and had knowledge and experience available to impart.

Annie also related her view of how important first-hand experience was as she described the time she spent as a volunteer in the classroom of a family friend. Annie's mother encouraged Annie to pursue a career in education, so Annie took one week off from her high school studies to visit her mother's friend's classroom. In this classroom, Annie spent a week as the teacher's assistant. Annie reported that

her five day experience in the classroom had convinced her to become a teacher and that teaching was to be her career.

Annie's choice to become a teacher was heavily influenced by her family. Annie's mother was the first to suggest that Annie investigate becoming a teacher. Also, Annie was the oldest child in her family, so she babysat her younger siblings and frequently read with her younger sister. On occasion, Annie tutored her younger brother and his friends when they needed help with their homework. Annie also served as an advisor to her mother on matters having to do with the foster children in their home and those served by Annie's mother who were placed elsewhere. In all of these experiences, Annie was given a position that carried a degree of authority as a result of her having knowledge, experience, and abilities. This reinforced Annie's strong belief in chains of command and hierarchies.

Annie was accustomed to taking on responsibilities that were similar to those of Bright Futures mentors. Annie's parents served as foster parents, so Annie spent time helping her mother take care of the foster children. When asked about her role with the children who were under the care of Child Health Services or living as foster children, Annie said, "the big thing I guess I strive for . . . at the time that these kids are living it [their lives before adoption], a lot of times they don't realize that there is a better life. No one has ever showed them that there is a better life" (P1I1 7/25).

In Annie's view, part of her role as a mentor was to broaden her mentee's perspective. For Annie, working with foster children was an opportunity to demonstrate her expert

knowledge. Annie described her role as follows:

> I guess a mentor is there to basically open up a new door, . . . that there is something outside their little community. I've found that a lot with [Annie's mentee], that she doesn't understand [the concept of a] "university", you know? It's not like, . . . she lives in [her mentee's home town and the location of the university Annie attended], yet she doesn't understand that. I didn't even live here and I understood the extent of the university. She lives right here, like, less than fifteen minutes away [from campus] and she doesn't understand that. I think it's, . . . a mentor is basically just to open up the door, . . . that there is a world outside. (P1I5 1/19)

Annie assumed that because she was an experienced member of the mainstream, it was her responsibility to educate her mentee about such matters. Annie believed that her experience and knowledge qualified her to have a position of authority over her mentee because she was capable of providing the information her mentee lacked.

Annie described extracurricular school activities that served to reinforce her beliefs in the importance of expert knowledge and hierarchical organizations. From middle school to high school, and into college, Annie participated in her school's marching bands. In her first interview, Annie said that she had worked her way up to being a band officer. When describing her responsibilities as a band officer, Annie said, "You teach people how to march" (P1I1 1/27). Throughout the Bright Futures field experience, Annie attended regular practice sessions for the band wherein she was charged with making sure her less experienced peers were ready for performances. Annie's participation in band reinforced her notion of authority being derived from having more knowledge and experience. In Annie's view, knowledge and experience are the prerequisites for having a position of

responsibility. Annie transferred these beliefs to her decision making for mentoring. Just as in band, Annie's mentee was there to learn from Annie because Annie was an expert who knew about the things her mentee did not.

Annie also relied on experiences from her part time jobs when making decisions about resolving dilemmas in mentoring. As an experienced shift worker at a fast food restaurant, Annie had taken on additional responsibilities to attend meetings with franchise owners and corporate representatives when changes in policy were forthcoming. Following such meetings, Annie had to help her co-workers learn the new policies. Annie functioned as the conduit through which policies and mandates traveled to her co-workers. Such policies and mandates were not subject to interpretation or negotiation. Her job reinforced Annie's belief that those with authority get to dictate policy, whether it is a corporate executive mandating policy changes for the franchise or a mentor telling her mentee how to complete a mathematics activity. Annie's meeting with the site manager confirmed for Annie that mandates move downward in hierarchies, and Annie was near the bottom rung of the Bright Futures ladder. Therefore, Annie saw it as her job to pass on to her mentee the site manager's mandate of work before leisure. Annie did not question this mandate and would not negotiate with her mentee in that regard.

When Annie's lived experiences are taken into consideration, it is not surprising that Annie's teaching beliefs and practices were authoritarian and traditional; she represents the extreme of this position among the four participants in this study. As a result, Annie responded to

dilemmas by taking control of the situation and, in most cases, telling her mentee what to do. Of the 73 times she talked about resolutions for dilemmas, Annie mentioned giving the right answer 19 times; Making information more basic 14 times; managing or controlling the focus, pace, or topic of mentoring 31 times; issuing directives or giving directions six times; adjusting the activity or plan three times (see Table 4-6). Common to all of Annie's resolution strategies is the factor of teacher control. Also, from the outset of the Bright Futures field experience, Annie established and maintained boundaries between herself and her mentee. Annie did not cross the lines she drew representing the parameters for the roles of mentors and mentees.

Embedded within all of Annie's strategies was her emphasis on maintaining control. In that sense, all of Annie's resolutions represent her preference for viewing dilemmas as affronts to her authority. As a result, Annie worked to maintain control over the use of time, the focus of the activities of her mentoring sessions, and the standards by which her mentee's work was judged. In a sense, Annie was "the boss" and her mentee had to do what Annie said; just like Annie had to do what her "bosses" (the director of Bright Futures, the supervising teacher, and the site manager) said she must do.

Whether the context was mentoring, band practices and performances, or working a shift making tacos, Annie seemed determined to do what she considered to be her duty. In Annie's view, her primary duty was to combat ignorance. In her response journal for her preprofessional studies course, Annie described her perception of a teacher's duty in this

way:

> Teachers in this society need to realize that a lot of pressure is placed upon them to correct the ways of the world. That's not the way it should be but it is. Teachers need to provide the mandatory education in order to allow the next generation to free itself from society's problems, ignorance, and decay. Only then will the people in this country be able to free themselves from their physical and mental prisons in which they live. (Response Journal 9/4/97)

Annie described her mentee's perspective as "tunnel vision of the world" (P1I5 2/18). In order to correct her mentee's vision, Annie believed that her responsibility was to tell her mentee what she didn't know. Hence Annie's pervasive resolution pattern of fixing the problem, which included the strategies of giving the right answer and making information more basic.

Annie also believed that it was part of her duty to teach her mentee to take responsibility for learning. In order to accomplish this goal, Annie attempted to teach her mentee that leisure time must be earned. In Annie's view, this lesson would preserve her mentee's desire to do art activities and include work on the academic skills Annie knew her mentee lacked. Annie said, "I explained to her that you have to do other things before we can do what we want" (P1I3 1/7). By suggesting this tradeoff, Annie hoped her mentee would find enough motivation to engage in school-like activities. Annie described her negotiations with her mentee as "doing the yucky stuff first. I was trying to follow what her mother told me because her mother doesn't want her to do art, her mom wants her to do schoolwork. So I was trying to make both sides happy" (P1I3 2/3). Making both sides happy

satisfied Annie's need to be reinforced for having done her duty.

Betsy's lay theory and approach to mentoring

Betsy's lay theory was that being a teacher was much like being a member of a child's family. Of the utmost importance to Betsy was establishing a close relationship between teacher and student. Though she specified that the relationship between a teacher and her students was a form of friendship, Betsy expected to love her students and that they would love her reciprocally. Such a relationship, according to Betsy, would improve the teacher's effectiveness at delivering instruction. She believed that if she cared enough for her mentee, she would find success in mentoring. This belief was stated in Betsy's journal for her exploring diversity course, in which Betsy wrote, "as long as children know you love them things will work out (Response Journal 11/20/97). Betsy's aims for mentoring included establishing a loving relationship and making learning enjoyable for her mentee.

Betsy clearly stated her primary goal in her beliefs about teaching paper for her Research in Elementary Education course: "There were two major goals for our tutoring sessions; the first and most important was to develop a warm and trusting relationship" (Part C p.1). She reiterated this point during an interview in which she recalled introducing her mentee to some friends from her dormitory at the university:

> I always told people who asked me, my purpose is just to be her [Betsy's mentee] friend. I introduced her [to a few of Betsy's friends in her dormitory] and I went, "This is [Betsy's mentee]." [Betsy's mentee] said,

> "She's my mentor!" And I went, "Yeah, I am your friend too." (P2I5 3/41)

One of Betsy's criteria for a good relationship was plentiful communication. In Betsy's view, the amount of conversation between two people was indicative of their friendship; friends are comfortable enough together to talk freely. In her second interview, Betsy said, "I was really hopeful that I'd have someone who would really love to talk to me and we would have a really good relationship, and so far it looks like we will" (P2I2 2/28). For Betsy, her role in the relationship with her mentee revolved around being a good listener. Betsy described her view of the importance of her listening to her mentee in this way:

> I think it's good when the children [the mentees] hang out with adults, not so much the learning, I mean, that happens naturally. It's not so much the importance of, "Oh, let's sit down and do these math problems . . . " It's just, you're having someone that'll listen to you, basically, . . . just listen to you. [Betsy's mentee] thrives on that.
> (P2I5 3/31)

Betsy placed more importance on connecting with her mentee emotionally, rather than stressing academics. Betsy said to inquiries from friends, that mentoring entailed:

> I go there and [Betsy's mentee] and I just do activities together. I mean, most of our activities are not, like, facts, you know? We never sit down and do worksheets, basically. I just tell them we go and just have fun. We spend time together for two hours and just get to know her. I think that's the most important thing.
> (P2I5 3/51)

For Betsy, dedicating mentoring sessions to listening to the mentee, looking for opportunities for activities in her mentee's words, and becoming familiar with her mentee's interests insured that her mentee enjoyed the sessions.

Making learning enjoyable for students was the second most important of Betsy's beliefs from her lay theory about teaching. According to Betsy, students were more likely to learn when they were engaged in lessons or activities related to their interests. Betsy believed that it was the teacher's responsibility to gather and use information from students about the things they were interested in learning. In her beliefs about teaching paper, Betsy wrote, "I will need to devote countless hours to planning and finding resources . . . the love of children is not enough to make a good teacher (although it helps)" (p.5). Therefore, Betsy expected to spend a great deal of time fulfilling this responsibility in order to insure that her mentee was learning. Furthermore, Betsy was committed to making certain that her mentoring sessions were not school-like. Betsy described how she applied her belief about the importance of students' interests to mentoring:

> These kids just need to have fun and they just have to do things that they will enjoy. If, all of a sudden, you go in there [to the learning center] and you're like, "No. We're going to learn this skill," the child wouldn't be having fun. It'd be more like school. (P2I5 7/35)

While Betsy expected to help her mentee with academics, she chose to focus on "letting the child be who they want to be in the time they are with you" (P2I5 7/46). For Betsy, this meant that her priority for mentoring was to find activities that met with her mentee's approval and it was incumbent on her to find or create them. She spoke frequently about her efforts to make her mentoring sessions interesting to her mentee. She said, "I want her [Betsy's mentee] to feel it's [mentoring activities] enjoyable and she's going to have fun

when she's doing it" (P2I3 9/33). To accomplish her goals, Betsy utilized an approach to instruction that balanced traditional and holistic methods.

Many of Betsy's mentoring activities were developed inductively, a characteristic of holistic teaching (Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde, 1993). That is, she got ideas for activities as she and her mentee talked and her mentee exhibited interest and enthusiasm in a topic or project idea. For example, Betsy's mentee enjoyed telling Betsy stories, some were based on actual events from her mentee's life and some were fictitious. Betsy described how she and her mentee developed an idea for a play from one of her mentee's fictional stories so that it took several mentoring sessions to complete. Betsy responded to her mentee's enthusiasm by postponing her original plans in favor of writing the play and allowing her mentee to assume part of the responsibility for its completion. Betsy described her role in the production of the play and how she and her mentee developed several activities from this single idea:

> She's dictating the play and I'm writing it. Then we made the cover to the play . . . the cover for it, so we used sponge paint so it'd be more interactive. So we're having a lot of fun with it. So now we're trying to do a little bit at a time, you know, we sat down and got the beginnings, and we worked on it for like ten minutes on this Wednesday. So we're gonna slowly keep building on it . . . I let her decide if she wanted me to write or if she wanted to write it down. Because the way she tells stories, I just know she gets more involved if she doesn't have to stop and think about it . . . When we met on Wednesday, she went through and she reread the entire story to me again, so we could pick up on it. I'm really enjoying it. (P2I4 1/20)

Betsy used a holistic approach to develop her mentee's idea into several activities in which she and her mentee could work collaboratively as an ongoing project. According to the

Berlaks (1981), holistic instruction entails the following:

> That for learning to occur the student must think, mentally act upon the material, and "make sense" of the piece [idea,skill] by seeing it in relationship to something already known. Thus, aspects of knowledge are introduced when students are ready to integrate them. (p. 151)

Betsy did not consciously plan to use a holistic approach. Rather, she relied on her intuition to guide her when she wanted to develop an impromptu activity. Betsy described her responsive approach when she was asked to describe how her sessions were developed:

> As we're doing our activities, she tells me stories about like, things about her family and stuff. So, we do an activity for a while, and then when we finish the activity, or she loses interest, we go to a different activity. So we keep doing different activities, but sometimes it's spontaneous, . . . or, um, if she brings a book we do those . . . So, after the first set [of routine activities], we decide what we're going to do. After that it kind of just flows. (P2I3 6/29)

Betsy used this approach to develop and implement several projects during her Bright Futures field experience.

Betsy also relied on traditional instruction to help her mentee learn. When she wanted the pace of an activity to increase, Betsy would tell her mentee what to do. Her intention in such circumstances was to avoid having her mentee's progress stall as Betsy guided her toward full engagement in the activity. When Betsy taught her mentee to play Yahtzee, Betsy told her mentee enough to enable her to simulate playing the game. Betsy also told her mentee how to represent the components of a basic multiplication problem:

> We've been doing a lot of multiplication work because she mentioned she's been having a lot of trouble with understanding it . . . then I realized when I started working with her that she didn't understand it. She didn't have a clue what it was about. Like, she was

> trying to memorize the numbers, but she didn't have a clue what she was doing. You know, why she was doing it. So I taught her to put it into a sentence. You know, like, you're counting three, four times or whatever. We'd write it out so she'd understand exactly what's she'd doing. And now she's catching on real fast. (P2I6 1/21)

As in the example wherein Betsy taught her mentee to play Yahtzee, she relied on teaching as telling when she believed her mentee would find the prerequisite knowledge cumbersome. Betsy wanted her mentee to proceed to the enjoyable aspects of activities and hoped that her mentee would assimilate the basic components eventually.

Betsy's experiences as a sister and aunt provided the formative background for the role she played in mentoring. Whenever she visited her family home, Betsy spent many hours babysitting her ten nieces and nephews. She began babysitting in the fourth grade. When she began babysitting, Betsy said that she tried being a disciplinarian, but found that unpleasant. Her preferred role was "the doting aunt" (P2I1 6/9). For Betsy, doting meant making the child the center of attention and sharing responsibilities. Betsy believed that instead of disciplining, she could give children discretion over time and activities. With regard to the extent to which she was willing to give her mentee discretion over mentoring sessions, Betsy said, "I'm more focused on what [Betsy's mentee] wants. I will change almost anything I plan to do to something that she wants" (P2I5 7/54).

Betsy relied on her experience with her nieces and nephews when evaluating her mentee. She believed that her extensive background with children helped her in Bright Futures. When asked why some people have more dilemmas in

mentoring than others, Betsy said,

> Well, they [other mentors] might not have had a lot of experience [with children]. Some people go into teaching, but they haven't had a lot of experience with children and learn that no two children are alike, even if they were raised exactly the same. I mean, I have twin nieces and they couldn't be more different, you know; they're night and day from each other and they were raised the same way, obviously. (P2I8 6/45)

Spending time with her twin nieces gave Betsy a perspective that was useful for understanding her mentee. Generalizing from her experiences with her nieces and nephews to mentoring was useful to Betsy. She described how she used working with her niece as a generalization for her working with all children:

> I just adore children and I can't stand to see them being hurt . . . it's hard when you realize that you can't make everything all better in their lives . . . I have this one niece and she gets yelled at so much 'cause she gets into so much trouble. She is so hyper[active], but I don't mind. I love it, you know? I love being around her cause she's just so full of life and she's in so much trouble, so I won't ever yell at her. Everyone says I let her walk all over me. I'm like, 'No.' But she gets corrected all the time [by others]. I don't have to correct her too. So I say, 'Stop correcting her, . . . she's fine, she's good.' But that's not something I can control all the time she's around me, . . . I can't control the time she's around anyone else. I just think I try to do it [make everything all better in their lives] with all kids. (P2I5 6/18)

Betsy characterized her generalization as being focused on the wants and needs of children. In particular, Betsy focused on her nieces, nephews, and her mentee's feelings about themselves and how she could intervene when those feelings were negative. Betsy's mentee expressed concern over receiving a low grade in mathematics and that her self-image was damaged by her poor performance. Betsy relied on experiences working with her nephew to understand why her

mentee considered herself deficient. When describing her mentee's claims of her deficits, Betsy assessed her mentee using an experience with her nephew as a point of reference:

> She couldn't say 6 times 5 is 30. You know she had to think about it and to some kids that's being bad at math. My nephew is like that. He thinks if he's not fast enough then he's bad at math. (P2I6 10/35)

For Betsy, hearing her mentee say she was not good at mathematics was not alarming; rather, her mentee's statement was consistent with learnings about children's beliefs about themselves she garnered from the children in her family. From her experience with her nephew, Betsy knew not to accept literally what her mentee said about her mathematical ability.

The role Betsy played in mentoring was a direct parallel of the role she played as an aunt. In mentoring and taking care of the children in her family, Betsy focused on the needs and desires of the child rather than her own. Betsy relied on her ability to listen to children and accept them unconditionally. Listening to children was a prerequisite to Betsy's resolution patterns of finding a way to do what the mentee wants, accepting responsibility, and showing affection to the child. For Betsy, having a mentee who would talk freely was an imperative. In order for Betsy to be able to help her mentee, her mentee would have to provide information about things that were problematic. Betsy spoke about the importance of the mentee's communicativeness as if it were of concern to all mentors:

> We want everything to be okay in their world. And if it's not, we want to fix it. And if they don't tell us what it is [that's troubling], you can't fix it . . . you want to be able to offer advice and, you know, make everything all better. (P2I4 3/2)

In her first interview, Betsy described how she had hoped she would have a child who would be communicative and how that would accentuate her mentoring experience:

> I told you before I was really hopeful that I'd have someone [a mentee] who would really love to talk to me and we would have a really great relationship. So far, it looks like we [Betsy and her mentee] will. (P2I2 2/28)

Betsy placed a great deal of importance on communication between her mentee and herself. In particular, Betsy engaged her mentee in discussions in which she asked her mentee questions about planning activities and sought feedback from her mentee. For example, Betsy described how she determined the direction of mentoring sessions in this way:

> I ask her what she wants to do. Usually I ask her Wednesday what she wants to do for next week so I can plan the activities, . . . we're deciding on that. We talked about it; we decided what we're going to do. (P2I3 7/29)

Such questions served two purposes for Betsy. The first purpose for asking questions represents Betsy's belief in sharing with the child the responsibility for the choices of activities. Secondly, her questions imply how much Betsy cared for the child and the child's wishes.

Betsy transferred skills to mentoring that she used in her job as a resident assistant (RA) for a dormitory on the university campus. Her work as an RA and mentor reflects her beliefs about the importance of sharing responsibility and showing care for others. In her response journal, Betsy said, "I work for [the university's department of] housing as a resident assistant. As an RA I am responsible for enforcing all of the housing policies regardless of if I agree with them or not" (Response Journal entry 2). While

enforcement of rules and policies was a necessary part of Betsy's job as an RA, she went about fulfilling her responsibilities in a way that included abundant communication and the sharing of ideas. Betsy described how she dealt with her responsibilities of providing support and programming for residents:

> I have 47 girls on my floor and we share the lounge and everything and I'm in charge of programming and so I do diversity issues all the time; it's my job. It's very good. Three o'clock in the morning, I have to go up and down the halls and girls are all over the place. Whenever I am trying to study, I go into the lounge and there is always someone to talk to. If I want to go out and do something, that's good for me because I like to talk. I keep my door open (P2I1 7/8)

Betsy viewed her RA position as an opportunity to establish friendly relationships and learn about unfamiliar people, which are two of the stated aims of the Bright Futures field experience. As in her residence hall, Betsy's approach was to be available and responsive to those students to whom she was assigned. When asked to describe her role as an RA, Betsy said:

> I've been an RA for two years and my first semester in my current dorm area. They are not supposed to be segregated but it is the area that has the most minorities so my area was actually very diverse; like, my little section is very close, so we spend a lot of time at lunch talking and everything and now since I've been an RA, I have 47 people and they are all very different and so it is interesting trying to get to know each of them individually and their backgrounds and histories and everything, so I think it's great. I do programs all the time, like, you know, "Let's talk about this [issue]. Let's talk about that [issue]." (P2I1 5/26)

While Betsy was required to enforce rules and policies, she used her authority to implement programs that involved her student charges in giving feedback and input about Betsy's

management of her area of the dormitory. Betsy utilized negotiation and feedback in both mentoring and her work as an RA.

Betsy also transferred her knowledge of problem solving from her experiences as an RA to mentoring. She considered the ease with which she handled problems in mentoring to have been due to her experiences as an RA. Betsy said, "I'm a resident assistant, so my girls bring me problems all the time, I just deal with them" (P2I7 7/33). According to Betsy, the frequency with which she had to engage in problem solving as an RA helped her to solve problems with her mentee quickly and efficiently. When asked about how she came to be able to solve problems so readily, Betsy said, "you see a problem, you're going to deal with it. But you don't think about it, like, 'well, let me assess and let me ask what do I need to do now to get through the situation'" (P2I7 7/36). Her frequent exposure to problems as an RA made problem solving natural and automatic for Betsy.

Examination of Betsy's patterns of resolution reveals a coherent theme of responsiveness and caring. Given Betsy's family background and experiences as an RA, her patterns of resolution seem to represent the great value Betsy placed on nurturing. Betsy's resolution patterns for dilemmas in mentoring are examples of her efforts to nurture her mentee. Betsy's patterns of resolution consisted of finding a way to do what the mentee wants, accepting responsibility, and showing affection to the child. Her most pervasive strategy, finding a way to do what the mentee wants reflects Betsy's responsive and caring approach to mentoring. This strategy required Betsy to commit herself to investigating,

identifying, and incorporating her mentee's interests into mentoring sessions. Betsy committed herself to finding a way to do what the mentee wants; she mentioned this strategy 39 times (see Table 4-7). Of the total number of times Betsy mentioned resolutions for dilemmas, 66 percent of the resolution strategies she mentioned were in this category.

Betsy was the least authoritarian and used traditional teaching methods infrequently. Her preferred approach to teaching her mentee was to suggest that they engage in projects related to her mentee's interests; Betsy avoided project ideas that seemed school-like. To Betsy, school-like activities were stilted and uninteresting, without regard to the needs and desires of the child. When asked about the nature of her approach to mentoring, Betsy described it as:

> These kids just need to have fun and they just have to do things that they will enjoy. And if all of a sudden, you go there [to a mentoring session] and you're like, "No, we are going to learn THIS skill," the child wouldn't be having fun. It'd [mentoring] be more like school. (P2I5 7/35)

In Betsy's view, focusing on discrete academic skills in mentoring was not desirable; she preferred projects that tapped into several of the child's interests simultaneously. The following example illustrates how Betsy considered a skills approach ill advised:

> If you focus on one part of the child, like, "Oh, he can't read," or "Oh, he can't do math" then you're ignoring all the wonderful things he can do and all the wonderful things about them that he likes to do. (P2I5 9/33)

Throughout the Bright Futures field experience, Betsy maintained an emphasis on making sessions appealing to her mentee.

That Betsy was interested in holistic teaching and in trying to engage the whole child in activities indicates a recurrent theme in her mentoring: making the child feel good. Betsy said, "I'm just there to make her feel better. You know, so that she feels as good as she can while she's with me" (P2I5 6/9). To Betsy, helping a child feel better required sharing control over the focus and implementation of activities. Part of Betsy's responsibility was to present a variety of options for mentoring activities. Her mentee, then, was responsible for choosing one of Betsy's recommendations or suggesting something else. As Betsy described it, "I normally present her with the things I have planned, [then] she decides which of the activities she wants to do" (P2I3 6/17). Frequently, Betsy discussed possibilities for activities in advance, usually during her last session of the week. Knowing what kinds of things appealed to her mentee helped Betsy find appropriate materials to use and design activities that she knew her mentee would enjoy.

Cindy's lay theory and approach to mentoring

Cindy's lay theory consisted of her view of teaching as a technical endeavor. In Cindy's view, good teaching meant practicing a discrete set of skills in prescribed activities that were proven successful by experts. The experts were people who published books or magazines with teaching ideas or experienced teachers and professors who had spent numerous years in the classroom. Therefore, Cindy believed that she would be a successful mentor if she could locate good published sources of ideas from experts and choose the ones that suited her mentee's age group and skill level. Cindy

considered herself an absolute beginner with regard to learning how to teach and said, "I haven't had any experience with teaching" (P3I1 1/10). Later in the same interview, Cindy continued by saying, "I feel like this [mentoring] is kinda the first step in going toward the classroom" (P3I1 6/20). One of Cindy's primary aims for mentoring included determining whether she had chosen the right career. Cindy also aimed to help her mentee with his schoolwork.

Cindy viewed mentoring as a part of the Elementary Proteach program that initiated beginners into the profession of teaching. She described herself as a novice taking the first step toward becoming a teacher. She also characterized the field experience as a form of "breaking in" (P3I1 6/12) to the teaching profession. When asked to elaborate on what she meant by this, Cindy's response was:

> I thought it [mentoring] was to kind of break us in a bit so that if you [a preservice teacher] haven't had any experience working with kids . . . I mean, this is kind of good because you're [the mentor] working with one [mentee instead of many pupils]. It's not like you're having to deal with a whole bunch of 'em [pupils] . . . [mentoring is] a good way to get started [in the teaching profession] since you're [mentors]one-on-one with them [mentees]. (P3I7 5/1)

Cindy believed mentoring was designed to subject mentors to the challenges of teaching.

Cindy was convinced that mentoring was made difficult on purpose and that the problems she encountered were tests of her resolve to become a teacher. While no one provided explicit references to mentoring as a test of willpower, Cindy seemed convinced that her deductions were accurate. She said about her view of mentoring as a test

> It seems like they have us do it [mentoring] in our first semester that we're in the College of Education

> [so that] . . . it's kind of a way to decide if this [becoming a teacher] is what you really want to do . . . 'cause if you've never done anything [like teaching] before, then this is your first taste of what it's like. (P3I7 12/26)

When Cindy attempted to teach her mentee, she chose traditional methods. As she discovered that her mentee resisted her attempts to make mentoring sessions resemble school lessons, Cindy resorted to less active methods for instruction. By the third week of the field experience, Cindy resorted to a trial-and-error approach to find the right ways to help her mentee learn. Cindy described her process for assessing and choosing activities for her sessions:

> I try to pick a few different things [to do in mentoring sessions], like, kind of a wide variety. Because now I'm just trying to see what he likes and what he reacts well to . . . I'm not sure of my activities right now. I'm just trying stuff out on him . . . I'm just kind of making a mental checklist of what he likes to do. (P3I3 9/13)

The process Cindy used for teaching emphasized step-by-step learning of skills that increased in difficulty using a prescribed set of plans toward a preconceived objective. She described her approach to showing her mentee how to do mathematics:

> I'll show him, . . . if we're adding 5 + 5 written down right across the page, five plus five equals ten and he sees that and he knows that . . . 'cause there's five fingers on his hand and five on the other . . . .because he knows there are ten fingers. But if I write right under it [the math problem] 5 + 6 = 11, 5 + 7 = 12, he can see that going down . . . it goes ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, . . . and that it's five, six, seven, eight. If I ask him 5 + 9, he just doesn't really see the pattern to it. I try to explain it, you know, like, well if this is one after this and this is one after this one, what must this one be, you know? (P3I5 1/41)

Cindy believed that part of her job as a mentor was to show

her mentee the right set of steps to follow toward reaching the objective of a given activity.

Cindy seldom got the results she expected. Her mentee rejected all activities that did not include working on the computer, games, or arts and crafts. This was upsetting for Cindy because she used what she viewed as the proper techniques and proven activities that suited her mentee's needs. By the end of mentoring, Cindy was certain that she had not been successful as a mentor. In her final interview, Cindy blamed her teacher education program in part for her lack of success. In the following excerpt from her final interview, Cindy described how she considered those who support Bright Futures mentors to be partly to blame for her lack of success:

> I wish they'd [those who supervise Bright Futures and teach courses in the College of Education] given us more ideas for activities or told us where to look for [them] . . . it's like, I mean, I'm not that creative. If I just had, like, something to look at, then it's easier to get other ideas from that. That would have really been a good thing . . . [I] definitely needed more ideas of what you can do with them [mentees]. (P3I7 15/6)

Though Cindy accepted responsibility for being able to adapt activities that others had designed, the original ideas had to come from more knowledgeable or capable sources.

Finding suitable activities for her mentee was particularly challenging for Cindy, since she constructed each session on an individual basis. She viewed each session as distinct and that each activity was to begin and end on the day for which it was planned. Additionally, Cindy believed that it was her responsibility for all activities to provide opportunities to work on academic skills, even if the emphasis on skills was slight. At the same time, Cindy

recognized the importance of making activities enjoyable for her mentee. Consequently, Cindy considered mentoring difficult in terms of both planning and implementing activities. She said, "I don't know, ...it's [mentoring] just hard. Like, I could think of a ton of just stupid fun things to do with him, but making 'em [activities] so he's learning something is a bit harder" (P3I4 5/3). In the same interview, Cindy said, "I could just play games with him [the mentee] the whole time and that would be fun. I'm sure we'd have a good time, but he wouldn't necessarily learn anything" (P3I4 5/11). Cindy was torn between her desire to implement activities that were academically beneficial to her mentee and doing more leisurely activities that ensured success at keeping her mentee engaged. In Cindy's view, activities that did not have an explicit academic component were less desirable, but she felt incapable of providing academic instruction. Hence, Cindy defaulted often to activities that would keep her mentee busy and happy.

At the beginning of the field experience, Cindy attempted to find out what kinds of academic skills her mentee was working on in school. She asked her mentee to bring his homework and books, but he resisted. The only materials Cindy saw from her mentee's schoolwork were a storybook for Reading and a vocabulary exercise. As she realized she would not be able to rely on her mentee for information about the academic skills he needed help with, Cindy turned to other mentors for assistance. In particular, one of Cindy's acquaintances was a mentor at the same learning center who worked with Cindy's mentee's brother. Many activities Cindy used in mentoring were adaptations of

activities that her acquaintance had used and found successful with her mentee's brother. The remainder of the activities Cindy used in mentoring came either from resource books provided by her instructor for the Research in Elementary Education course, from the mentoring handbook, or from Cindy's recollection of things she had done and enjoyed as a child.

When taken together, most of Cindy's strategies and activities were aimed at getting and keeping her mentee engaged. Just as in her experience as a volunteer and babysitter, Cindy viewed her role as a mentor as a monitor; her job was to keep her mentee busy. As long as her mentee was engaged, Cindy felt at least partially successful as a mentor. When she could find them, Cindy planned activities that provided her mentee with academic skills practice. At such times, Cindy considered her sessions an extension of school that were more leisurely and enjoyable. Cindy described her view of how mentoring was a supplement to school:

> I think it's [mentoring is] probably pretty helpful. Not that it makes a huge difference; but I think it's just extra practice. Like, when him and I are doing games and stuff . . . I mean, I think it's worthwhile for him. It think it's some place to go for an hour after school, which is good. (P3I7 5/27)

In the same interview, Cindy elaborated on what she meant by "extra practice":

> We do work on spelling, counting, . . . addition stuff. It's extra practice for the kids. It's kind of neat, because they can come and do stuff with us for an hour . . . like, different activities . . . That's good. That's extra practice, but it's pretty boring. It's not too exciting for you [the mentor]. This is kind of a nice way [for the mentee] to get some extra practice. (P3I7 14/1)

Because of her few successes helping her mentee with academics, Cindy did not view herself as qualified to teach her mentee. Instead, she attempted to be an off-campus aide for her mentee's classroom teacher. Even when her efforts at teaching failed, Cindy felt that she was performing a useful function in that she was keeping her mentee occupied.

Dawn's lay theory and approach to mentoring

Dawn considered herself an accomplished teacher prior to entering the College of Education, and she enrolled in her teacher preparation program for the purpose of obtaining a credential that would make her a legitimate educator. Dawn aspired to be the director of a private swim school and had worked extensively as a swim instructor before her first semester at the university. In Dawn's view, she knew what was necessary to assume the role of a teacher but lacked the degree that would help her become more competitive in the job market for swim schools. In other words, she knew all she needed to know about teaching from having worked as a swimming instructor, so she invested minimal effort in planning and implementing mentoring activities.

Dawn made it clear in her interviews that the main reason she was a preservice teacher was because she simply needed a degree. As a result, data from interviews and observations likely provide, at best, meager insights into Dawn's lay theory about teaching. Instead of applying her lay theory of teaching to mentoring, it is possible that Dawn's approach to mentoring was more consistent with her theory about how to be a successful college student. This is reasonable given that Dawn viewed mentoring as a burdensome requirement of her teacher preparation program and did what

was most expedient when working with her mentee on both academic and leisure activities. In other words, it would not be reasonable to view what Dawn said about mentoring as reliable evidence of her lay theory of teaching.

Though she resented having to participate in Bright Futures, Dawn viewed mentoring as a mutually beneficial experience for her and her mentee. One of the benefits Dawn believed she derived from mentoring was that it offered an opportunity to verify her abilities as a teacher. Dawn described mentoring as a test:

> I get a chance to test the waters, . . . see if I'm really good at what I'm doing, you know? Or have a chance at doing it [teaching] better . . . [Mentoring is an] opportunity to improve it all . . . Well, if I'm going to teach, . . . I've taught kids, but I've taught kids sports, with the swimming and all of that, you know, . . . testing to see if I can get in there and do it on paper or with them on a paper, pencil, and textbooks or not. (P4I3 6/15)

Dawn viewed mentoring as a chance to find out whether her knowledge of how to teach swimming transferred to more academic or school-like settings.

Dawn was adamant that mentoring was beneficial for her mentee since, from Dawn's perspective, children such as her mentee needed role models. Dawn spoke about how mentoring was good for her mentee:

> It's [mentoring] giving kids someone to look up to, . . . have someone that is successful in life around them. That's good for them, . . . it's necessary for them . . . When you [a mentee] have somebody to look up to, it goes with you for a long time. So if this program continues, these kids have continuous role models. (P4I6 3/24)

Dawn assumed that her mentee had no positive role models and that her mentee's mother was "completely illiterate" (P4I8 5/4). Dawn made these assumptions after learning that her

mentee's mother was unmarried, had several children, and lived in subsidized housing. Dawn assumed that her mentee had few adults around her who were successful, so she could play that role. Dawn described herself as a "guiding hand and a stable one" (P4I8 10/20); she considered herself to have the qualities her mentee would need to emulate in order to find fulfillment in life.

Dawn relied on improvisation for a great deal of what she did during mentoring sessions. When she did plan, Dawn limited her planning to thinking of either a long term project or a topic or activity that could be completed in one session. With regard to her planning, Dawn said, "I use my lesson plans as a rough draft and I kind of go by the seat of my pants with her, you know?" (P4I4 4/9). Dawn's plans for a long term project were dashed when her mentee lost the journal that was the hub of their sessions and was to be their major project for the semester. Following the loss of the journal, Dawn spent more time improvising lessons or activities based on the circumstances of the day. For example, Dawn would ask her mentee if she had homework to work on; if her mentee did not have homework, Dawn would ask her mentee to pick out a game to play or offer to spend time working on the computer.

Dawn claimed that her dilemmas revolved around problems with time constraints or her conflicts with another mentor. She stated that "if dilemmas come up, they come up from time constrictions or my schedule" (P4I7 1/8). From the outset of mentoring, Dawn was very concerned about having enough time for her course work and mentoring. In her first interview, Dawn was feeling overwhelmed by the demands of her studies

and her field experience and said, "I just barely have time to breathe anymore" (P4I1 9/1). She even quit her job as a server at a restaurant because of her concerns about having time to study and plan for mentoring.

Though she admitted having difficulties with time management and keeping up with her course work, Dawn was confident that she knew how to teach. Before enrolling at the university, Dawn taught swimming to children between the ages of three and seven years. She began teaching swimming when she was ten years old. Her mother owned two swim schools and Dawn planned on managing the schools after she finished her degree. Though she had not taught children who were the same age as her mentee, Dawn expressed interest in challenging herself by working with an older child in Bright Futures.

Dawn considered herself to be a determined and capable person and believed that her determination would prevail over the obstacles she faced in her life and in her studies. Dawn and her family endured many hardships as her mother struggled to establish her swim schools following her divorce from Dawn's father. According to Dawn, the most challenging obstacle she had to face was her course work at the university. She admitted that she was, at best, an average student who did not always enjoy school and was accustomed to having to "fight and struggle and work at it" (P4I1 9/3). When she learned that she was required to participate in Bright Futures, Dawn quit her part time job in order to ensure that she had sufficient time to study. To Dawn, quitting her job signified her commitment to finishing her degree at all costs. Likewise, when facing mentoring

dilemmas, Dawn did whatever it took for resolution provided that she was able to continue her quest for her degree.

Dawn used traditional methods to teach her mentee. To Dawn, teachers were authorities or experts who were in the position of teacher because of their superior knowledge base. In Dawn's view, the role of teacher demanded leadership. She used terms like "demonstrate it" (P4I2 3/22) and "I kind of kept her on task" (P4I3 2/33) to describe how she delivered instruction. Telling her mentee what to do or what she needed to know was part of Dawn's role; she believed that her mentee needed to be told things in order to learn. Dawn illustrated how she viewed teaching as telling:

> I need to be very accurate . . . very accurate, because even with little kids it was always easier, because you could tell them . . . you have to tell them . . . flat out explain [it to]'em . . . a good example would be when I'm teaching a child how to swim. "OK, now get your face wet." They splash water on their face. It's different than "put your face in the water . . ." She's [the mentee] not going to understand the things I want her to do if I don't explain them well enough for her. And it's the same with teaching . . . You have to be able to explain clearly and explicitly what you want. Otherwise they'll go and splash water in their face rather than put their face in the water. (P4I2 9/33)

In addition to having clearly defined notions about how to teach, Dawn transferred her ideas about teaching from her experiences as a swimming teacher to working with her mentee. In the interview after she referred to her experiences as a teacher at a swim school, Dawn elaborated on her views about teaching her mentee:

> I have to be very explicit so that she understands what I'm looking for . . . Just to have a better understanding of the thing [subject matter], . . . about the task. I think you just have to be very literal with kids. Is that the right word? . . . Explicit because they take things very literal. (P4I3 11/4)

To Dawn, explicit and literal denote the dispensing of information that comprises much of a teacher's work. She formed her beliefs about teaching during the ten years she spent teaching swimming at her mother's swim schools. When facing dilemmas in mentoring, Dawn relied on what she had learned about teaching from her first-hand experiences as a swimming instructor.

Summary: The role of participants' lay theories and teaching archetypes

Preservice teachers' archetypes function as "safety nets" (Holt-Reynolds, 1992 p. 214), especially when they experience dissonance. For the participants, dissonance arose from their exposure to conflicting messages about the aims of mentoring emanating from their instructors at the College of Education and the parents and supervising teachers. Resorting to traditional, teacher-centered instruction was natural, comfortable, and familiar. The power of their lay theories overshadowed what they were learning from their instructors at the College of Education and from research literature. As a result, the participants were not ready to give proper attention to dilemmas arising from cultural differences.

How Annie, Betsy, and Cindy identified, defined, and resolved dilemmas was directly related to their lay theories. These participants fit the descriptions of the majority of the population of preservice teachers in the United States as set forth in the reviews of research on teacher education--their beliefs are robust and their ability to reflect on their beliefs is not well developed (Gomez, 1993). Therefore, Annie's, Betsy's, and Cindy's responses to dilemmas in mentoring mirrored their tacit beliefs about

teaching and learning. Dawn's responses to dilemmas in mentoring reflected her aim to be a successful college student. In other words, when facing dilemmas in mentoring, the participants relied on familiar strategies for resolving their dilemmas.

The four participants' reliance on traditional methods contradicts what they were exposed to in their course work at the university. At worst, their responses to dilemmas indicate that the participants had not integrated into their belief systems what they were learning in their intensive course work, which focused on reflective teaching and constructivist approaches to instruction. That is not to say that the participants were unwilling or unable to practice reflection or understand constructivist views of teaching and learning. Rather, the participants were observed using methods that did not reflect what they were studying in their course work. Little evidence surfaced in this investigation that indicates that the participants in this study altered their approach to mentoring as a result of having been enrolled in their teacher preparation program.

The participants may have relied on traditional, teacher-centered instruction rather than more holistic instruction because they had knowledge of little else. The presentation of teaching methods for diverse learners did not occur until several weeks into the Bright Futures field experience. Consequently, the participants had little time to integrate the new methods they were learning in course work.

In Annie's case (which represents an extreme example), the greatest influence on her approach to instruction in

mentoring was the presence of her mentee's mother at the learning center. The participant who most exemplified the ideals specified by Elementary Proteach was Betsy; she entered the program with many of the traits and characteristics of the kind of teachers the Elementary Proteach program aims to produce. Fortunately, Betsy's reliance on familiar strategies for resolving dilemmas yielded favorable results for all stakeholders in Bright Futures. It is not clear from the evidence collected for this study that either intensive course work or field experiences have the desired impact on the beliefs held by preservice teachers as they enter their teacher preparation programs.

The Influence of Stakeholderson Mentors' Dilemmas

When asked to talk about what types of things posed problems for them in mentoring, the four participants in this study spoke most frequently about pedagogical dilemmas. Because of their reliance on their lay theories and teacher archetypes, the participants felt compelled to behave more like traditional teachers than like mentors. Therefore, the participants focused on what they considered to be the type of problems teachers were most concerned with--pedagogical dilemmas. The participants' aims centered around being prepared to assume the roles of teachers that fit with their lay theories. They were most interested in learning lessons about teaching rather than learning lessons about cultural and social differences between themselves and the people who lived in the neighborhoods where mentoring took place.

The participants encountered three groups of stakeholders whose views differed about the aims for the

Bright Futures Mentoring Program and roles of the preservice teachers who serve as mentors. The university faculty who were involved either with supervision of the field work or taught the mentors in course work wanted the main focus of Bright Futures to be on affective and social objectives; that is, they primarily wanted the mentors to form relationships with culturally different children and understand their perspectives. The parents and the supervising teachers at the learning centers viewed the primary function of mentoring to be academic tutoring, since most of the children who participate as mentees need help with academic skills. As the field experience began, the mentors were caught between these competing aims.

The influence of university personnel on mentors' dilemmas

The participants in this study rarely talked about or sought assistance with mentoring dilemmas from university faculty. As there were few occasions when university faculty were present at the learning centers, the participants rarely had the opportunity to engage someone from the university when a dilemma arose during a mentoring session. When the participants asked for help with a dilemma, they tended to ask someone who was present when the dilemma arose, or someone who was familiar with their situations. Hence, the participants relied most often on other mentors or the supervising teachers for advice about dilemmas. Of the four participants, only Annie and Dawn mentioned having consulted with either their professors or instructors or faculty affiliated with Bright Futures. Annie and Dawn mentioned meeting with university faculty once during Bright Futures.

Both Annie and Dawn were ambivalent about the assistance they received in these meetings.

The influence of supervising teachers on mentors' dilemmas

All four of the participants saw the supervising teachers at their learning centers at least once per week. The participants' received written and oral feedback weekly from their supervising teachers about the quality of the participants' activity plans. While no conferences about activity plans occurred between the participants and their supervising teachers during observations for this study, all four participants reported having met with supervising teachers to talk about activity plans. When supervising teachers wrote feedback on the participants' activity plans, it was brief and included suggestions for sharpening the focus on academic skills instruction. When approached by mentors, the two supervising teachers observed during this investigation stressed the need for mentors to help their mentees with basic academic skills, since that is what they percieved the children to need most.

The influence of parents and caregivers on mentors' dilemmas

All four of the participants met with parents and caregivers at least once to discuss what was being accomplished in mentoring sessions. In these meetings with parents and caregivers, discussions typically revolved around verifying that the mentees were getting help with academics. When they met with the participants, the mentees' parents and caregivers as well as the supervising teachers at the learning centers called them "tutors". To the parents and caregivers of the participants' mentees, their children were involved in Bright Futures because they needed help with

academics. Parents and caregivers made it clear to the participants that academic assistance was a high priority for mentoring sessions.

The findings of this study indicate that parents had a greater influence on the content of mentoring sessions than the staff of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program or the mentors' professors and instructors at the College of Education. Three of the four participants had discussions about the content of mentoring sessions with at least one of their mentee's parents. All three parents expressed their desire for the participants to focus on academics, especially help with homework. Annie and Betsy's mentee's parents were very explicit in requesting that the mentors would avoid leisurely activities such as arts and crafts, drawing, and playing games. In Annie's case, her mentee's mother not only wanted Annie to focus on homework, but also was present during Annie's mentoring sessions. The parents' status in the mentees' lives and proximity to mentoring sessions combined to be an important factor influencing what the mentors actually did in mentoring sessions.

The participants seldom had the opportunity to engage in active reflection on the aim of forming relationships with their mentees. Such reflective activity was espoused by authorities in mentoring. This aim was stated in the mentoring handbook and discussed expressly in the two orientation sessions during the semester. While all four participants mentioned working to build a relationship with their mentees, they rarely reported experiencing dilemmas from the category of knowing the mentee. Ladson-Billings (1994) suggests that white preservice teachers often assume

mistakenly that their students of color respond to teachers in the same ways as their white counterparts. If Ladson-Billings (1994) is correct, the participants in this study may have assumed that their mentees shared their views of what comprised a good relationship. If this is true, then the participants would have difficulty recognizing dilemmas related to their efforts at building relationships with their mentees. None of the four participants reported having engaged in critical reflection about their relationship building process.

The mentees' parents and caregivers as well as the supervising teachers at the learning centers provided constant reinforcement for mentors' efforts toward achieving the aim of providing academic assistance for the mentees. These stakeholders were greater in number and closer in proximity to the mentors throughout the field experience than university faculty who worked with participants in Bright Futures. Therefore, mentors were exposed more frequently to parents', caregivers', and supervising teachers' views about the aims of mentoring. This imbalance of emphasis on the aims of Bright Futures could explain the participants' strong interest in pedagogy--mentors felt compelled to act as teachers. For the four participants in this study, dilemmas arose when they realized that they lacked the knowledge of how to teach their mentees. Such realizations must have been overwhelming considering that the participants had to work in close proximity to the stakeholders who wanted them to act as teachers. Therefore, it is not surprising that the participants spent more time thinking about pedagogical dilemmas than about any other kind of problematic situation.

The influence of mentees on mentors' dilemmas

The findings of this study support Bondy and Davis's (1996a) claim that Bright Futures mentees themselves have a great influence on how preservice teachers view working with diverse learners. In this study, mentees were influential on the participants' processes of dilemma resolution. Betsy's and Dawn's mentees were compliant and easy to work with and caused few dilemmas for their mentors. Annie and Cindy experienced great difficulty at times carrying out simple activities with their mentees who were often defiant and resistant. Though they were not studied directly for this investigation, it is likely that the mentees influenced the participants' processes of identifying, defining, and resolving dilemmas.

Examination of Table 4-1 through 4-5 provides evidence that each participant experienced Bright Futures in very different ways. For example, Cindy experienced dilemmas in numbers and categories that differ greatly from Betsy with regard to knowing the mentee. Cindy's mentee resisted anything resembling schoolwork or activities that required behavior that he associated with going to school. Conversely, Betsy had few dilemmas related to her mentee's behavior. Her mentee was bright, gregarious, and highly motivated. Moreover, Cindy and Betsy differed greatly in the degree of importance they placed on finding the best possible resolution for dilemmas. The data gathered for this study demonstrate that the mentee's attitude and behavior were factors that influenced how the participants experienced dilemmas.

Discussion and Recommendations

In the following section, the findings of this study are highlighted for the purpose of discussing their implications and utility for researchers and teacher educators. The emphasis of the recommendations is on preparing teachers to work in public schools with diverse learners. This section is organized according to the following findings from this investigation about the participants' identification and resolution of mentoring dilemmas:

1. The participants' most frequently occurring dilemmas were dilemmas of knowing how to teach.
2. The participants' resolution patterns were diverse and they reflected their life experiences and their definitions of mentoring.

Included in each discussion of the findings are recommendations for further study and practice by teacher educators, especially those who supervise field experiences or teach courses wherein preservice teachers grapple with issues of diversity and multicultural education. The implications and recommendations discussed below may not generalize to other field experiences; however, they provide insights as to how teacher educators might structure, implement, and evaluate similar programs.

Finding 1. The Participants' Most Frequently Occurring Dilemmas were Dilemmas of Knowing How to Teach

Because of the logistics of conducting a mentoring program in public housing neighborhoods (at a distance from the College of Education), the preservice teachers who participate in Bright Futures often contend with mentees' parents, caregivers, and other stakeholders and are rarely

accompanied or supervised by university personnel. When this study was conducted, Bright Futures was not structured so that university personnel worked at the learning centers; rather, each learning center was staffed part time by one supervising teacher (a classroom teacher from the schools attended by mentees at the learning center) and a site manager (a parent and/or resident of the neighborhood surrounding the learning center). During the semester in which this study was conducted, there were as many as twenty mentors per day attending the learning centers. While supervising teachers were of great assistance to mentors, they were responsible for providing feedback on activity plans, observing mentoring sessions and handling any unanticipated problems that arose for all of the mentors who worked at their assigned learning centers. As a result, the supervising teachers were often unable to attend meetings between mentors and parents or caregivers. The participants in this study had little or no experience conferencing with parents and caregivers and felt overwhelmed by demands that they provide academic tutoring. Providing assistance with schoolwork was a secondary aim of Bright Futures; however, the main aim was to provide an opportunity for mentors to build personal relationships with mentees. It was not uncommon for parents, caregivers, and other stakeholders to view these aims as mutually exclusive.

For the participants in this study, their close proximity to and inevitable meetings with stakeholders provided the impetus for their defaulting to the methods of traditional teachers and traditional instruction. Given their circumstances, the participants responded reasonably to

the demands for working on academics placed on them by the most important people in their mentees' lives--their parents and caregivers. It was quite a challenge for the participants to concurrently appease their professors and instructors and the parents and caregivers of the mentees. The participants' professors and instructors assumed that mentoring was conducted for the purpose of helping the mostly white, female, middle class preservice teachers form relationships and gain insights about children of color from low income families. The mentees' parents and caregivers demanded that mentors provide academic instruction. Having to choose between these competing aims sets up an ominous dilemma wherein either choice carried undesirable consequences.

In essence, the participants felt compelled to choose sides and appease the stakeholders who were close in proximity to mentoring and vocal about their views of what mentors should do, which was to serve in a traditional teaching capacity. As first semester preservice teachers, the participants possessed few skills and limited knowledge about pedagogy, traditional or otherwise. Hence, they mentioned dilemmas of knowing how to teach more frequently than any other type of dilemma.

Berlak and Berlak (1981) state that teachers do not always perceive all dilemmas that may be present as they conduct their work. Rather, teachers attend to the dilemmas that they assign priority status. In the present study, the participants ignored the sociocultural dilemmas that accompanied the pedagogical dilemmas they spoke of most frequently. Many sociocultural dilemmas arose simultaneously

with the participants pedagogical dilemmas, such as Annie's mentee not knowing where the university was located and Dawn's mentees not knowing how to write mystery stories. Instead of being pedagogical problems, these dilemmas are likely related to the mentees' socioeconomic status. What appeared to Annie and Dawn as ignorance could have been expressions their mentees' social class. It is not uncommon for poor, minority children not to have been exposed to places like university campuses and reading materials that are familiar to middle class preservice teachers; however, the participants did not talk about their dilemmas in sociocultural terms.

Why did the participants overlook such sociocultural dilemmas? Why were so few dilemmas mentioned in the categories of knowing the mentee and knowing the people in the neighborhood? It is probable that a multitude of sociocultural dilemmas lie just beneath the surface of the dilemmas identified by the participants. While they did not discuss them explicitly, these sociocultural dilemmas are evident in the participants' descriptions of their experiences in Bright Futures. It is important to note the presence of such unspoken dilemmas when considering strategies for studying and improving teacher education for diversity.

Recommendations for further research

While the findings of this study indicate that the participants spent more time talking about dilemmas of knowing how to teach than dilemmas of knowing the mentee or knowing the people in the neighborhood, questions remain as to the reasons for this trend. Further study is needed of

the settings in which Bright Futures mentoring occurs, especially how mentors interact with parents, caregivers, other stakeholders, site managers, and supervising teachers. It is imperative to know if the benefits of field experiences in unfamiliar settings outweigh the pitfalls; namely that mentors must not only become familiar with and build a relationship with their mentees, but they must also learn to work in close proximity to parents, caregivers and stakeholders. Though their course work included readings on the influence of parents on children in school, little time was devoted to preparing the mentors to work well with parents, caregivers, and other stakeholders. This seems to be a confounding variable that could override some of the positive effects of course work and strategies aimed at helping mentors work well with mentees.

While this investigation surfaced extensive data on the beliefs and aims for mentoring of the four participants, additional study is needed on the beliefs and aims of parents, caregivers, stakeholders, and especially the supervising teachers. It is apparent from the analysis of data for this study that mentors can be heavily influenced by parents of mentees. Given the average age and status of mentors in comparison with parents and caregivers, it is not surprising that mentors like Annie completely change their approach to mentoring when their methods come under scrutiny. It would be very useful to study the beliefs and aims of parents and caregivers to know to what degree they are likely to support the use of strategies advocated by the mentors' instructors and professors. Such data could be gathered as part of the application process as parents and caregivers

submit their applications for their children to participate in mentoring. While it is unlikely to find total agreement among university personnel, parents and caregivers and their beliefs about teaching and aims for mentoring, knowing which parents' views are in accord with university personnel could aid the selection process for mentees. At minimum, more communication among stakeholders and university personnel is warranted.

In addition to gathering data on the beliefs and aims of parents and caregivers, more intensive study is needed on how the preservice teachers are influenced by parents, caregivers, and stakeholders. All four participants in this study altered their approaches to mentoring in response to meetings with parents. Given the participants' desire to please their mentees' parents, they did not view as dilemmas parents' requests for increased emphasis on academics; they tended to view such requests as mandates and did not consider doing anything other than honoring the requests. A study of the influence that parents and caregivers have on mentors would provide university personnel with insights as to the types of strategies mentors need to be taught for negotiating the aims of mentoring with parents and caregivers.

Recommendations for practitioners

It was the finding of the present study that the participants' predominant dilemmas were pedagogical in nature. This finding illuminates the need for improving the course work taken concurrently with field experiences. The syllabi of the course work taken by Bright Futures mentors need to be changed to include an earlier emphasis on teaching methods. As preservice teachers are likely to rely on

teaching methods they observed as students, it is crucial at this stage of preservice teachers' development for teacher educators to intervene and model examples of alternative means of instruction.

In order to improve levels of communication about their aims and roles in Bright Futures, mentors and stakeholders need to have meetings conducted at regularly scheduled intervals. Such meetings need to be attended by an experienced supervisor at the outset. For such critical exchanges of information about the purposes and practices of mentoring, mentors need an advocate present who is knowledgeable about the aims and goals of the Bright Futures Program and about supervision of preservice teacher education field experiences. Whether a supervising teacher or professor, the advocate must be informed about the aims of Bright Futures mentoring and be able to explain how to reconcile these aims to mentors and all stakeholders. It would be beneficial for mentors and stakeholders to recognize the importance of maintaining a balance between social and academic aims for the mentees. If this strategy were implemented, then parents and caregivers would be given their rightful responsibility of choosing whether participation in Bright Futures is desirable for their children since some are more interested in having them tutored in academic subjects. A general meeting could be a requirement for all mentors, stakeholders, and university personnel prior to the first session for the purpose of clarifying the roles of all participants. That way, parents and caregivers could make a well informed decision about the benefits for their

children's participation in Bright Futures and the precedence will be set for mentor-parent/caregiver meetings.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of this strategy, a plan needs to be made for a well defined process for mentor-stakeholder meetings. All mentors, supervising teachers, university personnel and stakeholders need to know that everyone involved with Bright Futures is well informed about the possibilities and limits of the program. During orientation programs for the mentors, university personnel, and supervising teachers could introduce the policies and procedures for mentor-stakeholder meetings and address participants' questions and concerns in advance. This way, mentors are made aware of their roles and responsibilities and how they must present these to the stakeholders. While mentors need to be held accountable to the aims of the program, they also need to know that they are not merely academic tutors. This is necessary for the mentors are at the beginning of their teacher preparation programs and have limited, if any, experience working with or teaching children.

The findings of this study could serve to inform the process of selection of supervising teachers in that the best candidates would be those who were aware of the perspectives of mentors, stakeholders, and university personnel. Especially since mentors such as Cindy use the Bright Futures field experience as a litmus test for their suitability to the teaching profession, the role of supervising teacher becomes extremely important in mentors' forming their views about working with diverse learners. Choosing supervising teachers carefully and with a set of criteria defined by the

research on mentoring and early field experiences seems of paramount importance.

Finding 2. The Participants' Resolution Patterns were Diverse and they Reflected Their Life Experiences and Their Definitions of Mentoring

While it is likely that some instructional strategies familiar to preservice teachers could be useful for instruction, numerous studies and major reviews of the literature on teacher education for diversity suggest otherwise (Lanier & Little, 1986; Livingston & Borko, 1989; Zeichner, 1986). The majority of the preservice teacher cohort in the United States consists of white, middle class females who have little experience with or knowledge about diverse learners (Ashton, 1996; Barry & Lechner, 1995; McCall, 1995; Haberman, 1996). Teacher education programs around the country have responded to this problem by including multiculturalism in course work and providing field experiences wherein preservice teachers work with diverse learners.

The Bright Futures Mentoring Program is an example of teacher education reform aimed at providing the knowledge and experience preservice teachers need to be successful in today's classrooms. In support of Bright Futures, the course work for the Elementary Proteach program has been continually revised to include increasing emphasis on multiculturalism and strategies for working with children of color. The preservice teachers enrolled in Elementary Proteach have demonstrated improved attitudes toward diversity and report having learned important lessons about working with diverse learners (Bondy & Davis, 1996b). While the findings of this investigation show that the four participants rarely, if

ever, used strategies learned in their teacher education courses, does this mean that they are not internalizing what they study in course work? Are they only "talking the multicultural talk" and not "walking the multicultural walk" as Grant (1981) suggests?

This study did not surface examples of the participants' practices that can be readily identified as strategies for diverse learners. Throughout this investigation, participants were asked to talk about dilemmas in mentoring; they spent the majority of their time describing dilemmas of knowing how to teach. The participants seem to have maintained a dichotomy of theory and practice when it comes to the ideology to which they are exposed in their preparation program and the practical requirements of mentoring. They seemed not to realize the potential benefits of using strategies they read about in their Research in Elementary Education and Exploring Diversity courses. Instead, they defaulted to comfortable, familiar ways of implementing instruction that resembled teaching they had seen, responded to, or had practiced before. In other words, the course work and experiences encountered by the participants in this study were not compelling enough at the time to cause them to rethink or reshape their archetypes and lay theories about teaching.

Likewise, their practices in mentoring were not yet reflective of their teacher education course work. Annie, Betsy, and Cindy began their first semesters in their teacher preparation program using their robust archetypes of teaching. Only Betsy's archetype was consistent with the image of an effective teacher that is promoted in Elementary

Proteach. Clearly, some preservice teachers enter their preparation programs with ideas about teaching that are likely to help them work well with diverse learners; however, preservice teachers may not be conscious of their archetypes. Other preservice teachers such as Dawn may not apply any theory whatsoever to their practices. Betsy was simply doing what came naturally to her; she began Bright Futures with ideas about teaching that fit well with the aims of the program. It may be unwarranted to expect significant changes in preservice teachers' archetypes of teaching during their first semesters in their teacher preparation programs.

Knowles and Holt-Reynolds (1991) state that preservice teachers' development as professionals occurs in stages. When they begin their teacher preparation programs, many preservice teachers are limited in their abilities to identify and solve problems related to pedagogy. Frequently, such preservice teachers resort to coping strategies in order to survive what they often consider overwhelming obstacles as they try to assume the role of teacher. The four participants in this study had little exposure to teaching methods during the semester of Bright Futures; therefore, they may have operated in a survival mode in order to cope with mentoring dilemmas. At the time of the present study, the participants may not have been ready to internalize what they were learning in their teacher education courses.

The lack of impact of preservice teachers' course work is especially troubling if the Berlaks (1981) are correct and teachers transmit their own cultural meanings to their students through their patterns of resolutions for dilemmas. At worst, the participants are perpetuating the hegemony that

Apple (1990) describes. For example, the participants tended to rely on traditional instruction when their mentees needed help with academics. Teacher educators for diversity have noted the preponderance of the use of this traditional approach to education in American public schools, which limits the possibilities for children of color to be more successful in school (Ladson-Billings, 1995b).

At a minimum, the course work designed by university personnel is having less than the desired effect on the preservice teachers who become mentors. All of the professors and instructors who taught courses in which the participants were enrolled knew about their students' lack of preparedness for working with their mentees. Yet the messages of the course readings on diversity and discussions of multicultural issues seemed not to have penetrated deeply into the participants' thinking about pedagogy. Reading articles from educational journals, chapters from textbooks, attending classes, and completing reflective writing assignments was insufficient for the four participants to alter their most deeply held beliefs about teaching. It is probably unreasonable to expect such results during the first semester of the teacher preparation programs. Nevertheless, it is discouraging to see so little evidence of course work concepts in the mentors' practice.

Recommendations for further research

While this study adds to the research documenting the impact of Bright Futures on the preservice teachers, investigations of the effects of mentoring on the children are also needed. Data could be collected each semester that Bright Futures is underway documenting the academic and

social progress of the mentees. As many children participate in Bright Futures for more than one year (two complete field experiences occur in one school year), longitudinal effects of participation in Bright Futures could be measured. Another possibility for further investigations would be to conduct studies of what happens to the preservice teachers in their student teaching experiences that follow Bright Futures. That way, the impact of mentoring could be assessed in the long term.

One of the premises behind the aim of building relationships between Bright Futures mentors and mentees is that the children will derive benefits in self-esteem and interpersonal skills. Studies of the interpersonal benefits of participation in Bright Futures would be useful in evaluating the overall effectiveness of the Program. Baseline and follow-up data could be gathered by classroom teachers, other qualified school personnel, and the preservice teachers who serve as mentors. Classroom teachers or other qualified school personnel could complete Social Skills Rating System indicators (see Fantuzzo, Manz, & McDermott, 1998) for children who participate in mentoring to gather data on improvements in their social interactions. The preservice teachers could complete "kidwatching" exercises in their mentees' classrooms before and after the Bright Futures field experience in order to document the children's progress with regard to social skills. While many insights into the effects of the field experience have been garnered from studies of Bright Futures to date, important questions are yet unanswered about the effects of mentors' strategies on the mentees.

Inherent in most approaches to preparing preservice teachers to work with diverse learners is the creation of dissonance either in course work or fieldwork that will prompt reflective thinking. The findings of this study leave questions about the effectiveness of the approaches of instructors and professors aimed at promoting the use of culturally responsive strategies by the mentors. This study revealed that the four participants relied primarily on teaching strategies that they were familiar with before entering their teacher preparation program. Further study is needed to determine the level of dissonance mentors experience in course work and fieldwork is sufficient for them to reconsider their entering beliefs. It would also be of benefit to investigate what kinds of supports must accompany the dissonant experiences, such as providing more explicit help with teaching strategies (Ross & Smith, 1992).

Recommendations for practitioners

The four participants in this study needed more contact with professional educators who have experience working with diverse learners. Specifically, they would have benefited from more interaction with university personnel while working at the learning centers. Cindy and Dawn tended not to devote much time to mentoring away from the learning centers. It is possible that they could have had more success with their mentees if they had been required to seek guidance and feedback before, during, or after their sessions. Just as in later field experiences in which all of the mentors will participate, mentoring would be improved if trained field experience supervisors were available to the mentors and

conferencing was a requirement of the Bright Futures Mentoring Program.

The four participants in this study would have benefited from more direct discussion of mentoring dilemmas in their course work at the university. All four reported that they seldom discussed mentoring in their courses, with the exception of Exploring Diversity. Though the exploring diversity course was focused on issues of diversity and mentoring, it met once per week in a large auditorium with 150 students. Also, none of the participants reported having more than two conversations about mentoring with any professors during the field experience. Informally, Cindy said that her interview sessions for this study were helpful in that she was able to talk through her dilemmas and potential resolutions. Just sitting and talking about her experiences in Bright Futures helped Cindy to cope despite having a very difficult time with her mentee. In her interviews, Cindy was asked to focus on resolving her dilemmas using what she had learned in her course work. Such discussion would be of benefit to all mentors.

Both of the above recommendations would work well in complement with a third recommendation, that mentors be required to do more deliberate and continual reflection on their experiences in Bright Futures. In particular, mentors need to have time set aside for them to do such reflection, as they often report feeling overloaded by their course and fieldwork during the Bright Futures semester. It is not to say that there were no opportunities provided for mentors during the field experience; Cindy reported that she found useful the beliefs about teaching paper required for the

Research in Elementary Education course, but that was done at the end of the semester. Also, all mentors kept journals in their Exploring Diversity course; however, there were few opportunities for the professor and students to discuss the contents of journals during the semester. Preservice teachers in early field experiences need scaffolds to be stronger and to be provided with more frequency. They also need more contact with university personnel who can help them focus on a broader range of dilemmas, not just dilemmas of knowing how to teach.

Mentors need to have at least one opportunity per week of the field experience to discuss with a professor their dilemmas, resolution strategies, and planning. These sessions need to be built into the preservice teachers' schedules as part of the program for first semester preservice teachers in Elementary Proteach. All mentors need to have a chance to discuss publicly their dilemmas so that they can support one another and university personnel can identify mentors like Cindy who find few successes in the field experience. Seminars could be held during classtime in mentors' course work, so professors and instructors could conduct such small group discussions on a weekly basis. This is particularly relevant to the research course in that it focuses on issues of diversity and strategies for working with diverse learners.

Finally, the present study illustrates the need for increased funding directed toward the support of field-based teacher education programs. In order to provide the scaffolds of support preservice teachers need while experiencing the dissonance of working in unfamiliar settings

with diverse learners, teacher educators need sufficient financial resources to provide adequate support. Increased funding is needed so that university personnel can dedicate sufficient time to meeting with preservice teachers as they work toward resolution of the myriad dilemmas they encounter in field experiences. Increased funding could also provide additional university personnel to coordinate the planning and implementation of field experiences.

Summary

The present study suggests potential interventions for teacher educators who provide dissonant early field experiences for preservice teachers aimed at broadening their perspectives about diverse learners. Case studies were constructed for the purpose of describing how four preservice teachers identified and resolved mentoring dilemmas. The investigation yielded a hierarchy of dilemmas in categories of knowing how to teach, knowing myself, knowing the mentee, and knowing the people in the neighborhood. This hierarchy matched the participants' beliefs about teaching and the role of the teacher, which were the strongest and most robust influences on their identification and resolution of dilemmas.

The present study suggests that the participants resorted to practices that resembled the most familiar strategies they knew: traditional teaching methods. Most often, these strategies were aimed at helping the mentees with academic skills and were the strategies the participants had seen used by their teachers or those they had used themselves with their siblings, family members, in school, and in part time jobs. Other influences such as parents and

caregivers, supervising teachers, and the mentees played a role in how the participants identified and resolved dilemmas, reinforcing the participants for assuming the role of a traditional teacher.

In such early field experiences, preservice teachers often lack knowledge of pedagogy, especially methods for working with diverse learners. Teacher educators need to ensure that preservice teachers receive adequate, individualized support and opportunities for broadening their perspectives in early field experiences. Most importantly, teacher educators need to build in scaffolds of support to early field experiences so that the unique needs of each preservice teacher can be met. Such scaffolds will allow preservice teachers to garner important understandings about working with diverse learners, yet not become overwhelmed by demands that they function as teachers in the earliest stages of their preparation programs. The four case studies and discussions of the contrasts between them may help teacher educators understand how such scaffolds could be designed for early field experiences, especially those wherein preservice teachers are placed in unfamiliar settings to work with diverse learners.

APPENDIX

Interview Guide--Interview 1

1. Tell me about your student in mentoring. What is s/he like?

2. Talk to me about mentoring at . What is it like?

3. How do you feel about being a mentor?

4. What is challenging about being a mentor?

5. Are there things you are struggling with? Explain.

6. What worries do you have at this point?

7. Are there things that confuse you about mentoring? Explain.

8. What kinds of things would you like to have known before going into this? Why these? Explain.

9. We have studied Reflective Teaching in the Research course and something called a dilemma. Are you encountering dilemmas? What are they? Explain.

Interview 2

1. What did you do with your mentee during your latest visit?

2. Is there anything new you would like to tell me about your mentee?

3. What are you struggling with in mentoring?

4. Have you encountered any dilemmas? What are they?

5. If you were talking to another mentor about this dilemma, what would you call it?

6. What are your plans for your next mentoring session?

8. Do you have plans for dealing with the dilemma you mentioned? Explain.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 162, pp. 67-92.

Apple, M.W. (1990). Ideology and curriculum (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Armaline, W. D. (1995). Reflecting on cultural diversity through early field experiences: Pitfalls, hesitations, and promise. In R. J. Martin, (Ed.). Practicing what we preach: Confronting diversity in teacher education (pp. 163-180). New York: State University of New York Press.

Ashton, P. T. (1996). Improving the preparation of teachers. Educational Researcher, 25(9), 21-22, 35.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Transforming the mainstream curriculum. Educational Leadership, 51(8), 4-8.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. M. (1989). Multicultural Education: Issues and perspectives. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. M. (1993). Multicultural Education: Issues and perspectives (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Barrett, E. R. (1995) Foreward. In G. A. Slick (Ed.). The field experience: Creating successful programs for new teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Barry, N. H., & Lechner, J. V. (1995). Preservice teachers' attitudes about and awareness of multicultural teaching and learning. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(2), 149-161.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. Methuen: New York.

Beyer, L. E. (1984). Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 36-41.

Beyer, L. E. (1991). Teacher education, reflective inquiry, and moral action. In B. R. Tabachnick & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), Inquiry-oriented practices in teacher education (pp. 113-129). New York: Falmer Press.

Bondy, E. (1989). What is good teaching? Views of "experienced" preservice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bondy, E. (1994). Preparing teachers to meet the needs of at risk students: A community partnership. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Bondy, E. (1995, January). The possibilities of tutoring in public housing neighborhoods. Paper presented a the Qualitative Research in Education Conference, University of Georgia.

Bondy, E., & Schmitz, S. (1991, October). Undergraduate tutors and housing project children: New experiences and changing attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Kansas City, MO.

Bondy, E., Schmitz, S., & Johnson, M. (1993). The impact of coursework and fieldwork on student teachers' reported beliefs about teaching poor and minority students. Action in Teacher Education, 15(2), 55-62.

Bondy, E., & Davis, S. C. (1996a). Helping them learn, getting along, and the lessons of tutoring: Preservice teachers tutor in public housing neighborhoods. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Bondy, E., & Davis, S. (1996b). The functions of an early field experience in a culturally different community. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, March.

Bondy, E., & Davis, S. (in press) The caring of strangers: Insights from a field experience in a culturally unfamiliar community. Action in Teacher Education.

Brown, C. E. (1992). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.) Diversity in teacher education: New expectations(pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Borg, W. R, & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.

Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1990). High school mathematics review lessons: Expert-novice distinctions. Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, 21(5), 372-387.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Sleeter, C. E. (1996). Field experiences: Planting seeds and pulling weeds. In C. A. Grant & M. L. Gomez (Eds.) Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom, (pp. 371-388). New York: Merrill.

Bullough, R. (1992). Beginning teacher curriculum decision making, personal teaching metaphors and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 8(3), 239-252.

Cannella, G. S., & Reiff, J. C. (1994). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity: Constructivist orientations. Action in Teacher Education, 16(3), 37-45.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). Classroom practice: Teacher images in action. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Clark, M., & Bondy, E. (in press). Examining changes in preservice teachers' attitudes toward teaching poor and minority students. Educators for Urban Minorities.

Cruickshank, D. (1987). Reflective teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Cushner, K., McClelland, A., & Safford, P. (1996). Human diversity in education: An integrative approach (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The right to learn and the advancement of teaching: Research, policy, and practice for democratic education. Educational Researcher 25(6), pgs. 5-18.

DeHart, P. R. (1992). Dilemma language for our futures: A study of preservice teachers in a neighborhood center computer lab. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. New York: The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1932). Theory of moral life. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Dilworth, M. E. (1992) Preface. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), Teacher education: New expectations (pp. xi-xvi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eisner, E. W., & Vallance, E. (Eds.). (1974). Conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Fantuzzo, J., Manz, P. H., & McDermott, P. (1998). The preschool version of the Social Skills Rating System: An empirical analysis of its use with low income children. Journal of School Psychology, 36(2), 199-214.

Farber, K. S., & Armaline, W. D. (1994). Examining cultural conflict in urban field experiences through the use of reflective thinking. Teacher Education Quarterly, 21(2), 59-76.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 212-223). New York: Macmillan.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? Teaching and Teacher Education, 3(4), 255-273.

Fenstermacher, G. D., & Soltis, J. F. (1986). Approaches to teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Finney, S., & Orr, J. (1995). "I've really learned a lot but . . .". Cross-cultural understanding and teacher education in a racist society. Journal of Teacher Education 46(5), pp. 327-333.

Fisher, C. J., Fox, D. L., & Paille, E. (1996). Teacher education research in the English language arts and reading. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (2nd ed.) (pp. 456-480). New York: Macmillan.

Fuller, M. L., & Ahler, J. G. (1987). Multicultural education and the monocultural student: A case study. Action in Teacher Education, 9(3), 33-40.

Garibaldi, A. M. (1992). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), in Teacher education: New expectations (pp. 23-39). San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gay, G. (1986). Multicultural teacher education. In J. A. Banks, & J. Lynch, (Eds.) Multicultural Education in western societies. New York: Praeger.

Gay, G. (1996). A multicultural school curriculum. In C. A. Grant, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.). Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom(pp. 37-54). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Giarelli, J.M., & Chambliss, J.J. (1990). Philosophy of education as qualitative inquiry. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.) Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods (pp. 30-43). New York: The Falmer Press.

Gomez, M. L. (1993). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching diverse children: A review with implications for teacher education and practice. Journal of Negro Education, 62(4), 459-474.

Goodlad, J. I., & Lovitt, T. C. (1994). Integrating general and special education. New York: Merrill.

Goodman, J. (1985). Field-based experience: A study of social control and student teachers' response to institutional constraints. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11(1), 26-49.

Goodman, J. (1992). Feminist pedagogy as a foundation for reflective teacher education programs. In L. Valli (Ed.) Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques, (pp. 174-186). New York: SUNY Press.

Goodwin, A. L. (1997). Multicultural stories: Preservice teachers' conceptions of and responses to issues of diversity. Urban Education, 32(1), 117-145.

Gore, J. M., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(2), 119-136.

Grant, C. A. (1981). Education that is multicultural and teacher preparation: An examination from the perspectives of preservice students. Journal of Educational Research, 75(2), 95-101.

Grant, C. A. (1994). Best practices in teacher preparation for urban schools: Lessons from the multicultural teacher education literature. Action in Teacher Education, 16(3), 1-18.

Grant, C. A. (Ed.) (1995). Educating for diversity: Ananthology of multicultural voices. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Grant, C. A., & Gomez, M. L. (Eds.). (1996). Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (pp. 403-23). New York: Macmillan.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Race, class, gender exceptionality, and educational reform. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks, Multicultural Education: Issues and perspectives. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Grant C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). On becoming a reflective teacher. In C. A. Grant (Ed.). Preparing for reflective teaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Greenman, N. P., & Kimmel, E. B. (1995). The road to multicultural education: Potholes of resisitance. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(5), 360-8.

Grossman, H. (1995). Teaching in a diverse society. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gutek, G. L. (1995). A history of the western educational experience (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights IL: Waveland Press Inc.

Haberman, M (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (2nd ed.). (pp. 747-765). New York: Macmillan.

Harrington, H. L., & Hathaway, R. S. (1995). Illuminating beliefs about diversity. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(4), 275-84.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teacher. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 325-349.

Hood, S., & Parker, L. (1994). Minority students informing the faculty: Implications for racial diversity and the future of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 45(3), 164-171.

Hudson, L. M., Bergin, D. A., & Chryst, C. F. (1993). Enhancing culturally responsive pedagogy: Problems and possibilities. Teacher Education Quarterly, 20(3), 5-17.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Qualitative Research Methods (Vol. 1). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kleinfeld, J., & Noodhoff, K. (1988). Getting it together in teacher education: A problem-centered curriculum. Peabody Journal of Education, 65(2), 66-78.

Knowles, J. G., & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). Shaping pedagogies through personal histories in preservice teacher education. Teachers College Record, 93(1), 87-113.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Challenging customs, canons and content: Developing relevant curriculum for diversity. In C. A. Grant (Ed.), Educating for diversity. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. Teachers College Record, 97(1), 47-68.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a black professor teaching white students. Theory Into Practice, 35(2), 79-85.

Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. Harvard Educational Review, 55(2), 178-194.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Third handbook of researchon teaching (pp 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Larke, P. J. (1990). Cultural awareness inventory: Assessing the sensitivity of preservice teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 12(3), 31-35.

Larkin, J.M. (1995). Curriculum themes and issues in multicultural teacher education programs. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), Developing multicultural teacher education curricula (pp. 1-17). Albany: SUNY Press.

Larkin, J.M., & Sleeter, C.E. (1995). Developing multicultural teacher education curricula. Albany: SUNY Press.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. Review of Educational Research, 52(Spring), 31-60.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1991). Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling. New York: Routledge.

Livingston, C., & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 36-42.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, R. J. (Ed.) (1995). Practicing what we preach: Confronting diversity in teacher education. New York: SUNY Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

McCall, A. L. (1995). Constructing conceptions of multicultural teaching: Preservice teachers' life experiences and teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(5), 340-350.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). Challenging prospective teachers' views during early field experience: A Quixotic undertaking? Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 12-20.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.). (pp. 171-193). New York: Macmillan.

National Center for Educational Statistics, Office of Education Research and Improvement, (1991). The conditions of education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1993). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9(1), 27-39.

Novak, J., & Musonda, D. (1991). A twelve-year longitudinal study of science concept learning. American Educational Research Journal, 28, pp. 1153-1171.

O'Brien, T. C. (1989). Some thoughts on treasure-keeping. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(5), pp. 360-364.

Paine, L. (1989). Orientation towards diversity: What do perservice teachers bring? (Research Report 89-9). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62(3), 307-332.

Raths, J. D., & Katz, L. G. (Eds.) (1986). Advances in teacher education, Volume 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Rice Jordan, M. L. (1995). Reflections on the challenges, possibilities, and perplexities of preparing preservice teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(5), 369-374.

Ross, D. D. (1989). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2) 22-30.

Ross, D. D., Ashton, P. & Mentonelli, C. (1989). Developing reflective teachers: The connection between university coursework and elementary classrooms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ross, D. D., & Bondy, E. (1993). Learning from our students and each other: A story of changes in content and practices in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Ross, D. D., & Bondy, E. (1996). Action in Teacher Education, 18(3), 44-55.

Ross, D. D., Bondy, E., & Kyle, D. W. (1993). Reflective teaching for student empowerment. New York: Macmillan.

Ross, D. D., Johnson, M. & Smith, W. (1991). Helping preservice teachers confront issues related to educational equity: Assessing revisions in coursework and field experiences. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Ross, D. D., Johnson, M. & Smith, W. (1992). Developing a PROfessional TEACHer at the University of Florida. In L. Valli (Ed.) (1992). Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques (pp. 24-39). New York: SUNY Press

Ross, D. D., & Smith, W. (1992). Understanding preservice teachers' perspectives on diversity. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(2), 94-103.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shimihara, N. (1990). Anthroethnography: A methodological consideration. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb, (Eds.) Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods (pp.76-89). New York: The Falmer Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). Making choices for multicultural education. New York: Merrill.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1994). Making choices for multicultural education (2nd Ed.). New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.

Sleeter, C. E. (1995). Teaching whites about racism. In R. J. Martin (Ed.), Practicing what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education (pp.117-130). New York: SUNY Press.

Slick, G. A. (Ed.) (1995). Making the difference for teachers: The field experience in actual practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Smeal, E. (1989). Education, pluralism, and equality. In H. Holtz (Ed.). Education and the American dream: Conservatives, liberals and radicals debate the future of education (pp. 30-38). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant Observation. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stake, R. E. (1985). Case Study. In J. Nisbet (Ed.) World Yearbook of Education 1985: Research, policy and practice (pp. 277-284). London: Kogan Page.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sugrue, C. (1996). Student teachers' lay theories: Implications for professional development. In I. F. Goodson and A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teachers' Professional Lives. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11(1), 1-25.

Tabachnick, B. R., and Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.) (1991). Issues and Practices in Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education. New York: The Falmer Press.

Tellez, K., Hlebowitsh, P. S., Cohen, M., and Norwood, P., (1995). Social service field experiences and teacher education. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), Developing multicultural teacher education curricula (pp. 65-78). Albany: SUNY Press.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Valli, L. (Ed.) (1992). Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques. New York: State University of New York Press.

Waxman, H. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Effects of early field experiences. In J. D. Raths & L. G. Katz (Eds.). Advances in teacher education (Vol. 2) (pp. 165-84). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Weatherly, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special education reform. Harvard Educational Review, 47(2), 171-197.

Webb, R. B., & Sherman, R. R. (1989). Schooling and Society (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (10th ed.). (1997). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Weinstein, C. S. (1990). Prospective teachers' beliefs about teaching: Implications for teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6(3), 279-290.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., and Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 130-178.

Wolffe, R. (1996). Reducing preservice teachers' negative expectations of urban students through field experience. Teacher Education Quarterly, 23(1), 99-106.

Woodson, C. G. (1969). The Miseducation of the Negro. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.

Yin, R. K. (1984). Case Study Research, Design and Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (1993). Case Study Research, Design and Methods (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Zeichner, K. W., & Tachnick, B. R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11(1), 1-25.

Zeichner, K. W. (1986). Content and contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. Journal of Education for Teaching 12(1), 5-24.

Zeichner, K. W. (1992). Conceptions of reflective teaching in contemporary U.S. teacher education program reforms. In L. Valli (Ed.) (1992). Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques (pp. 161-173). Albany: SUNY Press.

Zeichner, K. W. (1993). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning; Madison WI: The Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Zeichner, K.W., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (2nd ed.). (pp. 525-47). New York: Macmillan.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Steven C. Davis was born on November 12, 1963, in Agaña, Guam. He attended elementary and secondary school in Jacksonville, Florida. Steven acquired a bachelor's degree in elementary education in 1989 and a master's degree in elementary education in 1990, both from the University of Florida.

Steven was a classroom teacher for three years and taught third and fifth grades in a public elementary school. While attending graduate school, Steven taught courses for the Elementary PROTEACH program and the Office of Instructional Resources, supervised student teachers, and supervised preservice teachers in the Bright Futures Mentoring (formerly tutoring) Program, at the University of Florida. Presently, he is an assistant professor of education at Jacksonville University in Jacksonville, Florida.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Elizabeth Bondy

Elizabeth Bondy, Chair
Associate Professor of
Teaching and Learning

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Lee J. Mullally

Lee J. Mullally
Associate Professor of
Teaching and Learning

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dorene D. Ross

Dorene D. Ross
Professor of Teaching and Learning

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert R. Sherman

Robert R. Sherman
Professor of
Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Stephen W. Smith
Associate Professor of
Special Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as parial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 2000

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

LD
1780
2000
.D260

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08555 1504